From *Revue des études arméniennes* 30 (2005-2007), pp. 177-236.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM OF EARLY ARMENIAN MONASTICISM

by

Nina G. Garsoïan
F. B. A.
Columbia University
Emerita

Armenian monasticism in the later Middle Ages presents relatively few problems. From the foundation of the monasteries on Lake Sewan by Mariam Bagratuni princess of Siwnik‘ in 874, the great monastic centers of Armenia are well known and readily identifiable. These include the royal foundations of the medieval ruling houses, the Bagratuni, the Arcruni and the rulers of Siwnik‘: Hałbat, Sanahin, Varag, Tat‘ew, Tanahat, Ganjasar, Dadivank‘, Orotnavank‘, C‘ałac‘k‘ar among others, as well as such famous centers as the ones at Surb Karapet at Muš, Yovhannavank‘, Sałmosavank‘, Mak‘enoc‘, Goš, Glajor, Keč‘aris, Hałarjin, Gndevank‘, Ayrivank‘, Marmašēn, Amału/Noravank‘, Hařič‘avank‘, and innumerable others beyond listing here[1], as well as transferred communities such as the one at Narek, where Armenian monks fleeing from persecution in Byzantine Cappadocia established themselves in 935, and perhaps also the one at Hoṙomos in the same period[2].

The type of these foundations is also familiar. Wherever they are still standing, we find that these communities occupied large complexes usually comprising more than one church, to the facades of which imposing exonarthexes (*gawit*s or *žamatun*s) were added from the XIth century on.

[1] Asołik, II.vii, p. 173-176 = A-M, p. 29-33. See the numerous articles of H. Oskean in *Handes Amsorya*; cf *Buzand/Buzandaran* BP-G, p. 653; Thierry (1980);Id. (1989); Id. (1991); Id. (I993); Id. (2005); Id. (s.d.), p. 91, 133-134, 143-155, 157-160, 174-176, 196-222, 225-256, 275-281, 299-312; Mathews and Wieck, eds., (1994), p. 11, 14, 31, 91; Mahé (2000), p. 8-13, etc. and next notes.

[2] Thierry (1980), p. 1-2, 103 and fig.1; Id. (1989), p. 82; (Thierry and Donabedian (1989), p. 173, 176, 537; Garsoïan (1997) vol. I, p. 174. Cf. Ełišēivank‘, Thierry (1993), p. 103 for another refugee community. A parallel development occurs in this period in the neighbouring world of Iberia and Tao-K’larǰeti, see Martin-Hisard (1993), p. 565-572.

In addition to them, we normally find a number of secular buildings such as refectories, cells for the monks, libraries and bell towers. In the later medieval period these complexes became large agglomerations which normally followed the rule of Saint Basil[3]. We are told by the historian Step‘annos Ōrbelean that the community of Tat‘ew in the days of the katholikos Yovhannēs

> Was outstanding among all the others not only because of its buildings, but was also resplendent through its religious and clerical ranks up to five hundred brothers; it was full of cantors of harmonious songs, bringing close to the sea (of divine mysteries); it was also enriched with a school with scholarly training as well as skilled painters and incomparable scribes[4].

In AE 379/AD 930, his successor

> Yakob brought draftsmen and *zawrack‘* that is portrait painters from the distant land of the Franks and at great expense he had the brilliant roof of the God-dwelling temple entirely painted from top to bottom[5].

As such, these were not merely religious communities, but cultural centers and learned academies where renowned scholars and theologians, such as Step‘anos Siwnec‘i, Anania and Grigor Narekac‘i, or still later Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i, among many others, elucidated the faith, translated major works into Armenian and taught numerous disciples. Their scriptoria copied and illuminated texts that might otherwise never have reached us, as is the case for the famous School of Bałeš/Bitlis in the XVIIth century, without whose laborious devotion, most early Armenian texts might have been lost altogether[6].

Much has already been done, though by no means everything, in the study of these relatively well known communities. Such, however, is not my purpose here. What I should like to consider is the far thornier problem of Armenian monasticism in the pre-Islamic period, which has not yet been addressed directly as distinct from the forms characterizing the familiar later foundations.

Such work as has hitherto turned to the earlier period of Armenian monasticism, be it that of Gelzer, Thopdschian or Amaduni has proved

[3] Thierry (s.d.), p. 94-95. See below, n. 22 for the Basilian rule.

[4] SŌ, xli, vol. I, p. 271, “*երևելի էր ի մէջ ամենայնի ոչ միայն շինուածովք. այլ և պայծառանայր քահանայական և կրօնաւորական դասուք ի չափ 500 եղբարց. լի էր և ծովամատոյց փիլիսոփայիւք երաժշտական երգոց, ճոխ էր և վարժարանն վարդապետական կրթութեամբն. նա և արհեստաւորք նկարչացն և գրողաց անհամեմատք:*” = SŌ-B, p. 135.

[5] Ibid., xlix, p. 302, “*Այս Յակոբ ետ ածել նկարիչս և զաւռածս որ է պատկերագործ ի Հեռաւոր աշխարհէ Ֆռանգ ազգաւ. և զլուսաճեմ յարկս աստուածաբնակ տաճարիս բազում և անհուն ծախիւք ետ նկարել զբովանդակն ի վերուստ մինչև ի վայր*”. = Ibid., p. 150.

[6] Akinean (1952); Thomson (2001).

unsatisfactory on several major counts[7]. In the first place because they have projected the pattern clearly found in the later period into the earlier one, without verifying whether this anachronism was historically warranted or supported by the contemporary sources. Secondly they, and most other scholars, have also transferred these anachronisms to the relevant technical vocabulary without a sufficient analysis of its semantic content in the period we are considering. Finally, they have accepted the pervasive tradition which attributes the foundation of a number of major communities to saint Gregory the Illuminator himself, or sets them even further back to apostolic times. Consequently they trace them back to the fourth century if not earlier. For them, cœnobial monasticism penetrated into Armenia from Cappadocia in the second half of the IVth century. Such is the categorical position of Amaduni:

> La grande fioritura del monachismo in Cappadocia, ove tre insigni S. Padri, Basilio, Grigorio Nisseno (…) e Nazianzeno (…) vi diedero inpulso. S. Basilio (…) fu l'organizzatore e il legislatore della vita monastica cui diede l'impronta *cenobitica*, (…) e si conviene che fu grande l'influsso di S. Basilio sull'Armenia sotto S. Nersete il Grande (…) il carattere prevalentamente cenobitico (…) caratteristici distintivi del monachismo basiliano, e di quello cappadoce (…) è proprio anche del monachismo armeno.
>
> Il faut conclure que le monachisme avait déjà pénétré en Arménie au IVème siècle et qu'il était établi, sous sa forme cénobitique sur d'assez solides bases[8].

These hypotheses attributing the appearance of *cœnobia* in Greater Armenia to a relationship between Saint Basil of Cæsarea and the Armenian patriarch Saint Nersēs the Great rest primarily on the interpolated material in the otherwise valuable late fifth century anonymous *Epic Histories* /*Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'* long attributed to an otherwise unknown P'awstos Buzand or Faustus of Byzantium[9]. However, this relationship and its influence on the foundations of Saint Nersēs cannot be sustained on the grounds of either chronology or typology. As I have had the occasion to show elsewhere, the repeated intrusions of Basilian material, which contaminate the *Epic Histories*' accounts of the life of Saint Nersēs and play havoc with the chronology of the narrative, are interpolations from hagiographic *Lives* of Saint Basil and from the general Basilian fund which was part of the pious stock-in-trade of contemporary accounts. They have no valid connexion with the setting into which they have

[7] Gelzer (1895); Thopdschian (1904); Amaduni (1940); Id. (1958).
[8] Amaduni (1940), p. xvii-xviii; Id. (1958), p. 285.
[9] BP = BP-G, Introduction.

been thrust[10]. Most damaging for our purpose here, is the anachronistic account of Saint Basil's purported presence at Cæsarea during the consecration of Saint Nersēs which suggests that they were exact contemporaries:

> And a great miracle occurred. For as they were entering the church, a white dove came down upon the altar … And when the great chief–archbishop Ewsebios entered together with …a holy archpriest named Barsilios, the dove left the altar and came to rest over him and remained there a long time. But when the time was come at which they intended to consecrate Nersēs, the dove rose from St Barseł and settled down on the head of Nersēs[11].

Aside from the unmistakably hagiographic character of this episode, it is rendered altogether impossible by the fact that at the time of Saint Nersēs' consecration in Cappadocia, as the *Epic Histories* would have us believe, the still un-ordained young Basil was studying in Athens and could under no circumstance have been present as an "archpriest" at the ceremony[12]. On the Greek side, a survey of the cities visited by Saint Basil in his ordering of "Armenian" ecclesiastical affairs clearly demonstrates that all reference*s* to these activities in his *Letter* refer to Roman *Armenia Minor* west of the Euphrates and that the bishop of Cæsarea never crossed the river into Greater Armenia[13].

The most serious distortion deriving from this anachronism is the common assumption that Saint Basil's great foundation at Cæsarea of Cappadocia, the hospice served by monks known as the Basiliada, had been the model for Nersēs' charitable foundations in Greater Armenia. In fact, the two institutions were quite different in type. The Basiliada founded at the very gates of Cæsarea, was a single, vast, all purpose urban foundation whose services were carried out by monks under the direction of Saint Basil himself. As such it was an urban and monastic as well as a charitable institution, a city in itself.

[10] Garsoïan (1983), p. 145-149; BP-G, p. 28-29, 274 n. 5-7.

[11] BP, IV.iv, p. 82, "*Եւ եղեն մեծ սքանչելիք. զի մինչ դեռ այն ինչ մտեալ էին յեկեղեցին, էջ աղաւնի սպիտակ ի վերայ սեղանոյն …: Եւ իբրեւ եմուտ Եւսեբիոս արքեպիսկոպոսապետն … և երիցապետ մի սուրբ՝ որում անուն Բարսիղիոս կոչէր, թռեաւ աղաւնին ի սեղանոյն և հանգեաւ ի վերայ նորա, և յամեաց բազում ժամս: Իսկ իբրեւ եհաս ժամ՝ յորժամ կամեցան զՆերսէս ձեռնադրել, վերացաւ աղաւնին ի սրբոյն Բարսեղէ և նստաւ ի վերայ գլխոյն Ներսէսի:*" = BP-G, p. 111-112.

[12] Garsoïan (I983), p. 148 and n. 15.

[13] Ibid., p. 149-158. Deferrari 1962), p. xvii-xix, Saint Basil went to Athens in 351 and left in 355 or early 356. He dates Basil's stay at Anesi in Pontus from 358 to 365, Ibid., p. xxi

> a house of prayer built in magnificent fashion, and grouped about it, a residence, one portion being a generous home reserved for the bishop, and the rest subordinate quarters for the servants of God's worship arranged in order — access to all of which is likewise free to you magistrates yourselves and to your retinue. And whom do we wrong when we build hospices for strangers, for those who visit us while on a journey, for those who require some care because of sickness, and when we extend to the latter the necessary comforts, such as nurses, physicians, beasts for traveling and attendants? There must also be occupations to go with these men, both those that are necessary for gaining a livelihood, and also such as have been discovered for a decorous manner of living. And, again, they need still other buildings equipped for their pursuits, all of which are an ornament to the locality and a source of pride to our governor[14].

Such is not the case for Saint Nersēs' small and far flung foundations which he did not supervise personally. As the *Epic Histories* insistently repeat:

> He ordered the same thing to be done throughout the realm — in every district and every region, on every side and in every corner within the confines of Armenia: to indicate the most suitable places to be set aside for the building of almshouses for the poor and to collect the sick, the lepers, the paralytics and all those who suffered; leper-houses were designated for them, assistance and maintenance as well as shelters for the poor. For this was the order of the great chief-bishop Nersēs … that these people should remain exclusively in their own lodgings and should not go out as miserable beggars; indeed they should not set foot outside their door, but everyone should owe them protection……
> asylums — for-widows and for-orphans… in the various districts…
> And the same Nersēs had built hospitals in very town and every region, establishing maintenance and care for them. And he left trusted men as overseers for the sick and poor. He also entrusted them to such men as were God-fearing and who await the eternal Judgement and the coming of Christ[15].

[14] Basil, *Ep.* II, xciv, p. 150-151, "…οἶκον εὐκτήριον μεγαλοπρεπῶς κατεσκευασμένον ἀναστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῳν, καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν οἴκησιν, τὴν μὲν ἐλευθέριον ἐξῃρημένην τῷ κορυφαίῳ, τὰς δὲ ὑποβεβηκυίας τοῖς θεραπευταῖς τοῦ θείου διανενεμημένας ἐν τάξει, ὧν ἡ χρῆσις κοινὴ πρός τε ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς παρεπομένους ὑμῖν, τίνα δὲ ἀδικοῦμεν, καταγώγια τοῖς ξένοις οἰκοδομοῦντες, τοῖς τε κατὰ πάροδον ἐπιφοιτῶσι καὶ τοῖς θεραπείας τινὸς διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν δεομένοις, καὶ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν τούτοις παραμυθίαν έγκαθιστῶντες, τοὺς νοσοκομοῦντας, τοὺς ἱατρεύοντας, τὰ νωτοφόρα, τοὺς παραπέμποντας; τούτοις ἀνάγκη καὶ τέχνας ἕπεσθαι, τάς τε πρὸς τὸ ζῇν ἀναγκαίας, καὶ ὃσαι πρὸς εὐσχήμονα βίου διαγωγὴν ἐφευρέθησαν· οἴκους πάλιν ἑτέρους ταῖς ἐργασίαις ἐπιτηδείους, ἅπερ πάντα τῷ μὲν τόπῳ κόσμος, τῷ δὲ ἄρχωντι ἡμῶν σεμνολόγημα … "; cf. Garsoïan (1983) p. 159-160 and n. 72

[15] BP, IV.iv, p. 85, "*Հրամայէր յամենայն աշխարհի և ի գաւառս գաւառս և ի կողմանս կողմանս, ի կոյս կոյս, ի խորշս խորշս սահմանացն Հայոց. յայտ արարեալ զպատեհ*

Not only did the size of these numerous foundations and their scattering throughout Armenia differentiate them from the single urban Basiliada, but each of them seems to have served a particular purpose rather than be all-inclusive; nor do we find the slightest indication that their "trusted", "God fearing" overseers were monks. Specifically, Xad of Marag, Nersēs' pupil and deacon, whom the patriarch left as his vicar and set as supervisor over all his charitable foundations during his own long exile, is never identified as a monk but rather as a married man with grown children, as was Nersēs himself[16].

We have no contemporary indication that Saint Nersēs had sought models for his foundations in the West. The very *Epic Histories* that insist on the anachronistic linking of the two saints, never suggest a Basilian or western model for the Armenian foundations. On the contrary, the very passage describing the Armenian institutions notes that Saint Nersēs as patriarch had assumed the title of "defender of the dispossessed", the exact title of the great contemporary Persian *magupat*s[17].

But of all the factors distinguishing the two institutions, the most categorical is once again that of chronology. We know from the established sequence of Saint Basil's *Letters* that his charitable foundations do not seem to have antedated the great famine of 368 and the first mentions of hospices appear in 372-373[18], whereas the foundations of Saint Nersēs went back to the very beginning of his pontificate in the fifties of the fourth century[19]. Furthermore, the Basiliada, built on land granted by the emperor Valens at the time of his passage through Cæsarea in

պատեՀ տեղիսն զատուցանել. շինել աղքատանոցս, և ի ժողովել զախտաժէտս և զրկունս և զմարմնաՀարս ե զամենայն ցաւոտս. և նոցուն կարգեցին օրկանոցս և դարմանոց և ռոճիկ և պատանս աղքատաց: Զի այսպէս եռ Հրաման մեծ եպիսկոպոսապետն Ներսէս … զի այնպիսիքն միայն նստեալ լիցին յիւրաքանչիւր կայանս, և մի՛ ելանել ի մուրոյն տառապանսն մի՛ բնաւ ելանել ըստ իւրաքանչիւր դուրս, այլ զի ամենայն ոք պարտապան էր նոցա:" = BP-G, p. 113; BP. V,xxxi, p. 232, "*զայրենոցսն և զորբանոցսն … ի գաւառս գաւարս, … Եւ յամենայն աւանս էր շինեալ նորին Ներսիսի և Հիւանդանոցս, յամենայն կողմանց և ռոճիկս և դարմանս կարգեալս, և արս Հաւատարիմս թողեալ տեսուչս Հիւանդացն և աղքատացն. նոյնպէս և այնոցիկ յանձն արարեալ որք երկիւղածքն էին յԱստուծոյ՝ որք դատաստանացն յաւիտենականացն զալեստեանն Քրիստոսի սպասէին:*" = BP-G, p. 211.

[16] BP, IV.xii,115-116,118, ":*Եւ էին նորա երկու դստերք*" = BP-G, p. 134, 136.. For Nersēs, see ibid., p. 109, 395 s.n.

[17] BP, IV.iii, p. 78, "…*և Ջատագով ամենայն զրկելոց լինէր նա:*" = BP-G, p. 109; cf. Garsoïan (1981). Given his insistent linking of Saint Basil and Saint Nersēs, it seems inconceivable that the compiler of the *Epic Histories* should have missed the opportunity of mentioning an actual case demonstrating the influence of the first on the latter.

[18] Garsoïan (1983), p. 162-163.

[19] BP, V.i p. 191, "[*Ներսէս*] *շինէր աղքատաց Հանգիստ, որպէս և ինքն ի բնէ իսկ սովոր էր:*" Cf. Garsoïan (1983), p. 162.

January 372, was apparently completed in 373, the most probable year for the murder of Saint Nersēs[20]. Consequently it could hardly have served as a model for the earlier Armenian foundations.

It should finally be noted that the translation of Saint Basil's rule into Armenian does not go back to the earliest "Golden age" but is dated, largely on stylistic grounds, from the end of the Vth to the beginning of the VIth century[21]. The earliest references to communities living under this rule do not occur before the end of the IXth century for the monastery of Sewan headed by the future katholikos Maštoc'(†895) and they become widespread in the Xth century[22]. Hence, we have no secure evidence for any early presence of Saint Basil's rule in Greater Armenia. Nersēs' own foundations were destroyed by the king after the patriarch's murder[23] and there is no evidence that they were re-built by his son Saint Sahak. They do not, therefore, seem to have served as the original stage for the later foundations.

Under these circumstances, the entire problem of the forms taken by early Armenian monasticism needs to be reviewed altogether, even though the present state of our sources, especially in the critical area of archæology does not as yet permit us to reach final conclusions. In consequence, this survey must remain tentative and necessarily more negative than I might have wished. It cannot at present aspire to be more than a working paper. Nevertheless, it seems imperative at this point to clear the ground of gratuitous and insufficiently investigated, mostly anachronistic, assumptions that have stood in the way of a more accurate view of what little we can glean of the earlier period of the Armenian Church, which I will try to address directly. To achieve this will require, insofar as possible, an analysis of the archaeological material, of the reliability of the sources and of the precise implications of their seemingly familiar vocabulary.

[20] Idem, p. 162-163.

[21] Uluhogian(1993), vol. I, p. ix, "La convergenza di tutti questi dati, esterni ed interni, all'opera, sembra circoscrivere tra la fine del V sec. e l'inizio del VI l'epoca probabile della sua traduzione in armeno". Cf. Mahé (2000)), p. 22-23, who agrees with this dating.

[22] YK, xxx,xxxvi, p. 186, 229 = YK-M, p. 132, 150. A, III.iii,vii-viii, p. 160, 173-176, 181 "… *այրն Աստուծոյ Մաշտոց: Սա էր… ի մանկութենէ խոտաբուտ կենօք կեցեալ անապատաւոր ճգնութեամբ. որ և ի ծովուն Գեղամայ զկղզին Սևանայ բնակութիւն իւր արարեալ՝ չինէ զեկեղեցին ի նմա, որ Առաքելս անուանի: Ցոր միացեալ ժողովեցան եղբարց բազմութիւն, կանոնադրութեան սահմանաւ սրբոյն Բարսղի միակրօնք ի տան Աստուծոյ եղեալ, …* " = A-M, p. 29-33, 40

[23] BP, V.xxxi, p. 232-233 = BP-G, p. 211.

Even before turning to this task, we need a clarification of the word "Armenia" in the period under consideration. While linguistic and cultural similarity or indeed uniformity can unquestionably be demonstrated at the time of the Arsacid kingdom of Greater Armenia and in the subsequent interregnum, this is not the case for the political and administrative status in both the secular and ecclesiastical realms. Lesser Armenia [*Armenia minor*] west of the Euphrates had long been incorporated into the Roman Empire before its division into Armenia I and II by Theodosius the Great at the end of the IVth century. These two districts were ordinary Roman provinces included in the diocese of Pontus in no way distinguished administratively from the rest of the imperial territories and totally separated from the kingdom on the other side of the river, the greater part of which would pass to Persia by the end of the IVth century[24]. More importantly here, all the lists of those present at the first œcumenical councils show that the bishops from these two imperial provinces duly attended them in the wake of their respective metropolitans, the one of Sebaste for Armenia I and of Melitene for Armenia II. This was also the case for the bishop of Theodosiopolis in the new *Armenia Interior* acquired by Byzantium east of the Euphrates after the partition of ca. 387[25]. As such they formed part of the Imperial Church, whose authority and usages they fully acknowledged, so that their doctrinal position and ecclesiastical practices and institutions may not be used legitimately as characteristic for Greater or Persarmenia to the East or for its autocephalous Church.

Two points of reference for early Armenian monasticism must therefore be questioned from the start. Whoever were the "brothers" (*ełbark'*) from Sebaste whom Saint Gregory the Illuminator brought back with him after his episcopal consecration in A.D. 314 at Cæsarea of Cappadocia according to Agat'angełos — and the term *ełbark'* is far too imprecise to serve as a basis for any conclusion — they unquestionably came from the metropolis of imperial Armenia I. The development of a cœnobial type of monasticism in Cappadocia in the beginning of the IVth century is highly doubtful, and it is noteworthy that Agat'angełos, far from saying that Saint Gregory intended them to be the founders of

[24] Garsoïan (1998), p. 240.

[25] Ead.(1988), p. 259-260, 262-272. Ead. (1998), p. 241-242 and nn. 11-13. The subsequent alterations in the imperial toponymy do not concern us here. The bishops of the semi-autonomous southern Armenian Satrapies likewise belong to the Imperial Church under the general rubric of Ἐπαρχία Μεσοποταμίας, see Garsoïan (1988), p. 262-263, 267, and especially, 272-281; and Ead. (1998), p. 261.

monastic communities, states explicitly that he intended to "elevate them to the priesthood (*k'ahanayut'iwn*) in his own country"[26].

Far to the south-east "Armenian" monks were undoubtedly to be found subsequently in the entourage of Saint Sabas in Palestine as well as in Jerusalem according to the VIth century account Cyril of Skythopolis. Some, but not all of them may have come from Persarmenia. The most renowned of them, however, the "Armenian" John the Hesychast, was born in Nikopolis in Armenia I, his parents were named Enkratios and Euphemia, he would ultimately be consecrated bishop of Koloneia in his native province. His relations with Cyril of Skythopolis further demonstrate that he was a Greek speaker[27]. Less certain is the origin of the Armenians present in Saint Sabas' Great Laura. Among them, a certain number were obviously Armenian speakers, since we are told that they were allowed to perform the liturgy in their own language, but they were required to sing the Trisagion in Greek to make sure that they did not add to it the monophysite "Who wast crucified for us" as was the custom in Persarmenia[28]. Since they apparently complied and were allowed to remain some though not all must have been Chalcedonians. Consequently, these belonged to an atypical group and are not necessarily a safe index for the presence of a monastic presence in Greater Armenia to which the contemporary sources carefully refer as Persarmenia, reserving the unqualified toponym "Armenia" *tout court* for the Imperial territories of that name, so that conclusions derived from the presence of "Armenians" in Palestine should be used with prudence[29].

Proof of the existence of monastic complexes in Pre-Islamic Persarmenia will ultimately have to be furnished by accurately dateable archæological material. Unfortunately, this is not yet available and the fragmentary and insecure nature of the evidence does not permit categorical conclusions despite Oskean's numerous studies and Thierry's

[26] Aa §806, p. 344/5, "*Մեծաւ պատուով … զսուրբն Գրիգորիոս անտուստ յուղարկեցին իշխանօքն Հանդերձ: … գային Հասանէին ի քաղաքն Սեբաստացւոց … Եւ անդ գտանէր բազմութիւն եղբարց, զորս Հաւանեցուցանէր ընդ իւր գալ, զի վիճակեցուցէ զնոսա ի քաՀանայութիւն յիւրում աշխարՀին, և բազում գունդս գունդս յաճախեալ առնոյր ընդ իւր,*". For Gregory's consecration at Caesarea, see Ananean (1961)..

[27] Garsoïan (2002), p. 258 and nn. 5-6.

[28] CS, 105:3-15, 117:19-118:5 = CS-P, p. 114, 126-127. Cf. Garsoïan (2002), p. 267 and n. 48. The contemporary official use at this time of the addition to the Trisagion by the Armenian Church is attested in the *Answer to the Syrians* of the katholikos Nersēs II, GT', p. 177, "*և այսպէս փառաբանեմք, Սուրբ Աստուած, սուրբ և Հզաւր, սուրբ և անմաՀ, որ խաչեցար վասն մեր,*" = Garsoïan (1999), p. 461.

[29] Garsoïan (1983), p. 149-158. However, see below p. 220 and n. 190.

subsequent Herculean labour of identification, description and cataloguing[30]. Thierry has noted[31] that a number of the monastic foundations were traditionally attributed to Saint Thaddeus or his disciples[32] and Saint Bartholomew[33], or to Saint Gregory the Illuminator and on occasion his grandson Grigoris[34], to the virgin martyrs Hṙip‘simē and her companions during their journey through Vaspurakan and on Mount Sepuh[35], to Saint James of Nisibis[36], and on one occasion to one of the three magi[37]. However, as he also showed repeatedly, these legendary identifications going in a number of cases all the way back to apostolic times, and consequently raising the prestige of the foundations to which they were attributed, are not borne out by the physical remains which have come down to us or by historical evidence[38].

To mention but a few. Sepuh, associated with Saint Gregory and Manē, a companion of Saint Hṙip‘simē is not attested before the pilgrimage of the katholikos John the Historian who found a community of hermits grouped around the cave where the Illuminator had dwelt and built a church there in 921[39]. The fame of the foundation of the Holy Cross of Varag rested on a fragment of this relic presumably brought by Saint Hṙip‘simē in the IVth century, according to the anonymous *History of the Hṙip‘simean Saints* itself dating from the end of the eighth century, only to vanish upon the saint’s departure and to reappear miraculously in 664[40].

[30] See above, n. 1.

[31] Thierry (1989), p. 81-84. *et passim*. The cases are too numerous to list here, but see the next notes.

[32] Ibid., p. 82, 150, 154, 195, 215, 336; with St. Bartholomew, 343, 353, 385, 450-451; together with St. Bartholomew, 482; Id. (1991). 65, 89; etc.

[33] Thierry (1989), p. 452, 471.Similar associations with the legendary apostle of Caucasian Albania, the discple of St. Thaddeus, Ełišē, are to be found in Karabagh, where his monastery founded in the Vth century according to tradition, is actually attributed to monks fleeing from Mak‘enoc‘ ca, 730, SŌ, I.xxxiii, p. 203 = SŌ-B, p. 97, Thierry (1991), p. 103-111, 202.

[34] Ibid., 83, 149-150, 163, 178, 225, 244, 381, 413, 425; Id. (1991), p. 190; Id. (2005) p. 45, 53, 60, 66, 67, 102, 112, 123, 138.

[35] MX.Ps., Thierry.(1989), p. 82, 85, 133, 149-150, 154, 338, 403, 413-416, 419, 446; Id. (1991), p. 156; Id. (2005), p. 42, 112.

[36] Id. (1989), p. 316-324.

[37] Ibid., p. 409.

[38] Ibid., p. 82, “Le seul intérêt de ces récits légendaires est d’affirmer l’ancieneté de telles fondations, ce qui ne veut pas dire que les monuments qu’on a maintenant sous les yeux datent de l’origine du christianisme”.

[39] YK, lv, p. 357-359 = YK-M, p. 199; cf. also Ps.YM, p. 145 = Ps.YM-A, p. 104, who dates from approximnately the same period, as we shall see below p. 189 and n. 50; Thierry (1889); Id. (2005), p. 112-113; Thierry-Donabedian (1989), p. 571

[40] MX,Ps., p. 297-303; YC, p. 353; Outtier-Thierry (1990), p. 695-732; Thierry (1989), p. 133. Toumanoff (1961), p. 467.

Hogeac‘ vank‘, presumably founded by Saint Bartholomew and the repository of another fragment of the Holy Cross brought there by Saint Hṙip‘simē, is attested in 868, though its mention in the Hṙip‘simean *History* must place it before 800. The same approximate date is given by the appearance of the legend of Saint Bartholomew's coming to Armenia[41]. Dadivank‘ in Karabagh commemorated a legendary disciple of Saint Thaddeus, but it is first attested in connexion with the murder there of the last presiding prince of Caucasian Albania, Varaz Trdat II ca. 825[42]. The convent of Saint James of Kaputkoł or Blue Mountain in Vaspurakan was dedicated to Saint James of Nisibis upon a transfer of his relics presumably in the IVth century. It is however said to have flourished under the Arcruni kings in the Xth century and the legend is probably connected with the return of the saint's relics by the emperor John Tsimiskes on his capture of Nisibis in 974, a date consistent with the saint's panegyric by Gregory of Narek[43]. At Amału/Noravank‘ nothing remains before the XIIth century to attest a hypothetical hermitage of Saint John the Baptist[44]. Of the monasteries of which the date of foundation can be approximated, Mak‘enoc‘, from which part of the monks had come to Karabagh ca 730, can probably be traced back to ca. 700, since the katholikos Solomon who had been a monk there after the division of the community died in extreme old age in 791/792[45].

Without wearingly prolonging this list, it should already be evident that we have little direct material or epigraphic evidence predating the Bagratid period when we finally reach solid ground. In fact, with a few doubtful exceptions, monastic foundations as against isolated or palatine churches cannot be traced with assurance at present back of the seventh

[41] Thierry (1989), p. 452; cf MX. Ps; van Esbroeck (1973); Russell (1986), p. 255-260. The same association with the Hṙip‘simean saints and Saint Gregory is found among others at Ałoc‘vank‘ whose surviving architecture is Zak‘arid and consequently dating from the XIIth-XIIIth centuries, Thierry-Donabédian (1989), p. 474-475. Similarly Kapusivank‘, associated with St. James of Nisibis, is first first attested in 1222, Ibid., p. 542;. etc.

[42] MK-D, III.xxiii, p. 340 "*Զայս Վարազ Տրդատ և զորդի իւր Ստեփաննոս Ներսեհ ի Փիլիպեան՝ ազգակիցն իւրեանց սպան ի միում ժամու ի Խորաձորն, որ կոչի Դադոյի վանք:*" = MD, p. 226; Thierry (1991), p. 65 is of the opinion that "le véritable développement du couvent n'intervint qu'à la fin du XIIe s." Similarly, Xat‘ravank‘ associated with another disciple of Saint Thaddeus is dated by the foundation inscription of 1204 (or 1234), although an earlier building may have existed, Thierry (1991), p. 89-91

[43] GN; Thierry (1989), p. 316-323; Id. (s.d.), p. 145; Thierry-Donabédian, (1989) p. 543.

[44] Thierry (s.d.), p. 235-237.

[45] YK, xxiv, p. 141 = YK-M, p. 115, cf. p. 261-262.

century or even later[46]. To be sure, the surviving edifices may in a number of cases be reconstructions of earlier buildings, but until this is demonstrated by excavations *in situ*, which have too often proved impossible until now, their early date cannot be assumed, all the more so that early Armenian sources do not give us a single description of a "monastic" building such as are given in Cyril of Skythopolis' *Life of Saint Euphemios* and that of *Saint Sabas*[47]. Furthermore, none of the early Armenian sources contain any references to the destruction of any monastic establishment in their descriptions of the devastations wrought by war, nor do they mention the foundation of such establishments as against individual churches until the VIIIth century[48]. Hence, in spite of its lacunae and fragmentary character, the weight of such material evidence as we possess seems to set the early seventh century as the *terminus post quem* for the appearance of stable monastic communities in Greater Armenia.

Before we leave for the moment the purely archaeological evidence hitherto adduced, we must consider the much earlier date long accepted for the presence of a cœnobial type of monasticism in Armenia. This hypothesis derived from the account, purporting to describe the early foundation of the famous monastery of Saint John the Precursor /Surb

[46] Thierry (1989), on Vaspurakan, p. 82, correcting his earlier hypothesis concerning a possible early date for the monastery of Glakavank' (H.A., 1983, p. 390) concludes, "on compte peu de monuments qu'on peut fermement dater de cette époque [pré-arabe] … C'est le développement du monachisme qui suscita la plupart des foundations, mais le mouvement ne prit une grande ampleur qu'à la fin du IXe s.", p. 141, 150, 205, 231, 239, 266, 338, 359, 421, 444, 448, 451, 457, 459, 460, 469, 476. Id. (1993), *passim*, and fig.1, etc. Cf.. Ps.YM note p. 235. It should also be noted that in a number of cases the VIIth century date is given for a particular church rather than a complex. Cf. e.g. Ps.YM, p. 157, 176, 217 = Ps.YM-A, 111, 119, 135, where the church seems clearly distinguished from the whole of the monastery. The earlier foundation may have been no more than a hermitage turned into a monastery at a later date. E.g. at Hoṙomos founded in the thirties of the Xth century, "il est possible qu'il se soit agi d'abord d'un petit ermitage … limité à une ou deux églises" Thierry (1980), p. 113-117; cf. Id. (1989), p. 133 for Varag, 426 for Aparank'; Id. (2005), p. 142, etc. See also below, n. 48.

[47] CS, p. 63,24-27, 64,15-21; 100,7-14; 111,18-24; 123,5-8, 24-28; 130,15-19 = CS-P, p. 60-61, 109,120,132-133,139.

[48] So, for example even in the VIIth century, the Mamikonean and Kamsarakan near their palaces at Aruč and T'alin, see below p. 226 and n. 218. According to Ełišē, in the days of Šapuh [II] "… in every city …they built churches which surpassed in splendour the royal palace. They also built what are called martyria … and in every uninhabited spot they constructed hermitages [*յամենայն տեղիս անապատս միայնանոցս շինէին*]", this even in Persia, but he mentions no "monastic" establishments, E, iii, p. 60 = E-T, p. 110. Even in the VIIth century, the Ps Sebēos speaks of the building of churches in Armenia but refers to a presumed "monastery" only in the case of a foundation by the Sasanian Christian Queen Širin near the royal residence, S, xiii, p. 29 = S-T, p. 85; cf S, viii, xxvii, xxxiii, xxxvii, xlv, p. 4-5, 47-48, 64, 77, 112 = S-T, p. 66-67, 99-100, 112, 121, 147.

Karapet or Glakavank‘ at Muš by Saint Gregory the Illuminator. This presumably authenticating text had long been held to be a twofold *History of Tarōn,* of which a Syrian, Zenob Glag, was believed to have composed the first part in the fourth century in his own language, whence it was translated into Armenian. This first section was then thought to have been continued in the seventh century by Yovhannēs Mamikonean. The information contained in this work was considered particularly valuable since it attributed the foundation of the monastery to a *Letter* of detailed advice sent to Saint Gregory, who had brought the relics of the Precursor back to his own country, by bishop Leontius of Cæsarea, who had previously consecrated the Illuminator as bishop of Armenia[49]. This enduring hypothesis was acceptable as long as Zenob's portion of the work could be taken as a Syriac original of the IVth century. Unfortunately, as the result of a recent demonstration that the two parts of the *History* were in fact a single Xth century forgery, we no longer have any proof of the authenticity of the correspondence between Leontius of Cæsarea and Saint Gregory or of the monastery's early date. Its foundation must consequently be pushed forward to the IX-Xth century when it is first mentioned by the historian Uxtanēs Uṙhayec‘i[50].

In opposition to the unacceptable testimony of Pseudo-Yovhannēs, the official contemporary VIIth century correspondence that has survived gives us the one reasonably certain date for a monastic community coincident with the archaeological evidence and brings us once more to the beginning of the same century. During the quarrel between the Churches of Armenia and eastern Iberia or Kart‘li, which led to the schism between them before the end of the first decade of the century, bishop Movsēs of the border diocese of C‘urtaw fell afoul of his superior, the katholikos Kiwrion of Kart‘li and was compelled to take refuge in Armenia[51]. In the *Letter*, preserved in the collected correspondence of the Armenian Church known as the *Book of Letters* [*Girk‘ T‘łt‘oc‘*], which informs the *locum tenens* of the vacant Armenian katholikate Vrt‘anēs K‘ertoł of his troubles, the bishop of C‘urtaw specifies:

> And because of the hardships of winter and of the storm, I was constrained to remained in the monastery of Saint John the Baptist which is in Aragacotn

[49] ZG, p. 39-46 = Ps.YM, p. 58-61.

[50] Ps.YM, p. 32-33, 42-48. On the complex itself, which was almost totally destroyed in 1916, see Thierry (1983), cols. 380-406. This article was published before the critical analysis of Ps. YM, whose VIIth century date it consequently still accepts.

[51] Garsoïan (1999), p. 338-345.

> and I was welcomed by the elder of the community [*vanic‘ erēc‘*], the blessed lord Babiwlas[52].

This same Babwilas is included, once more as *vanic‘ erēc‘,* in the list of the Armenian ecclesiastics making their peace with the new katholikos Abraham I in 607[53].

As in the case of the material evidence, the ecclesiastical *Canons* purporting to contain material on early monasticism, which should be of primary relevance for this period, likewise remain as yet regrettably unsatisfactory. Akinean has shown that the presumably earliest *Canons* surviving, those purportedly composed by the katholikos Saint Sahak the Great belong to the VIIth century rather than the beginning of the Vth, as would have been the case had they been authentic, and Mardirossian attributes them directly to the controversial ecclesiastical figure of the VIIth century, Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i[54]. This later date is supported by the assertion in the XIth century Iberian treatise attributed to Arsēn Sap‘areli that a number of works had been composed under the name of Saint Sahak by the "heretic" Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i[55]. Their evidence must consequently be considered in the context of the VIIth and not of the earlier pre-Islamic period. Similarly, the *Canons* attributed to the late Vth century king of neighbouring Caucasian Albania, Vačʿagan cited in the *History of the Albanians* by Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i

[52] GT‘, p. 245, "*Եւ թէ որպէս վասն խստութեան ձմերայնւոյս և փքայոյզ լինելոյ, արգելեալ եղէ ի սրբոյ Մկրտչի Յովհաննու ի վանս որ յԱրագածու ոտին. և ընկալեալ ես ի ձեռն երանելւոյ տեառն Բաբիւլասայ վանից երիցու*‘" = Garsoïan (1999), p. 523.

[53] GT‘, p. 299; Garsoïan (1999), p. 279-280, 514. On the title *vanic‘erēc‘*, see below p. 201-203.

[54] KH, I, p. 363-421 Akinean (1950).The late date of these canons seems now to be generaly accepted. Mahé (2000) considers them "pseudépigraphes" and reflecting a VIIth century context, albeit containing earlier material, p. 21 n. 70, 24. Mardirossian (2004), p. 315, "Les *Canons de Sahak le Parthe*, rédigés par Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i"; cf.further, Id.(2006), p. 375-376, "Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i représente l'un des plus grand faussaires que l' Église arménienne médiévale ait connu." Moreover, "Parmi les œuvres qu'il a composées et qui sont placées sous le nom de 'saint Sahak', c'est-à-dire le patriarche saint Sahak le Parthe (387-438), figure un texte intitulé *L'Écrit sur la Tradition de saint Sahak catholicos des Arméniens*. Ce document … ne fut intégré dans le *Livre des canons armeniens (Kanonagirk‘ Hayoc‘*) que postérieurement à l'élaboration en 719 de la version canonique officielle de l'Église arménienne …La date précise de cette intégration reste inconnue, mais différents indices laissent à penser que *L'Écrit sur la Tradition* fut incorporé dans le KH dans la seconde moitié du Xe siècle". Conybeare,C, p. 828, 842, writing half a century earlier, also noted that the reference in the canons to the feast of the Mother of God necessarily implied a VIIth century date, although he attributed this to a later interpolation. Se below p. 200-201 and nn. 104-107.

[55] For the most recent discussion and bibliography, see Mardirossian (2004), p. 258-259, 282-288 and Id. (2006).

or Dasxuranc‘i[56], reflect a later period. In spite of the continuing arguments concerning the precise date of Movsēs' *History*, the majority of this compilation dates most probably from the Xth century resting in part on a VIIth century "core"[57].

The *Canons* attributed to the katholikos Nersēs II and bishop Meršapuh or Neršapuh of Tarōn his co-president at the Second Council of Duin in 555, if authentic, cannot of necessity pre-date the middle of the VIth century. Moreover, as we shall see, their terminology pertaining to "solitaries" and "monasteries" is open to interpretation and Hakobyan notes in his critical edition that canons xxx to xxxvii, which are the ones containing the "monastic" regulations, are not to be found in a number of manuscripts[58]. Hence, no firm conclusion on early "monastic" institutions may safely be drawn from them as well[59].

Because of its date, the most promising evidence should reasonably seem to come from the Council of Šahapivan held on June 24, 444, whose xvth and xvith canons apparently provide information pertaining to the problem of the early period of Armenian monasticism. According to canon xv:

> If anyone [*ok‘*] be [stand] in the faith and wishes to become [one of] the solitaries [*miaynakeac‘*] keep virginity and holiness and attain eternal life, let him be with his true companions and with *miabanakeac‘s* and they will benefit each other through the love of Christ, for "a brother helped by a brother is a firmly fortified wall"[Pr. 18,19?] and that "God settles *miakrawns* in a house/family" [Ps 67 (68),7], and "Where two or three are gathered in my name, I am among them" [Matt. 18,20] …
> Let there not be the custom to be alone for then how can they know the order and condition of the faith, or keep their transgressions in mind, or show obedience and love to their companions?[60]

[56] MK-D, I.xxvi, p. 89-94 = MD, p. 50-54.

[57] Dowsett in MD, p. xix-xx; cf. Aṙak‘elyan, MK-D, p. 5; Howard-Johnson (2002), p. 49-52.

[58] Hakobyan, KH, I, p. 475-490, 639; Mardirossian (2004), p. 623-625. In spite of the objections of Mahé (2000), p. 23 n. 79 and Mardirossian, cited by the latter *loc cit.,* there is little reason to think that a separate council was held in 552 in the light of the *Letter of Blame* addressed by the katholikos to the southern Armenian bishops who had not obeyed his summons, Garsoïan (1999), p. 233-236, 474-476. Moreover, the consecration of Abdišoy as bishop would hardly provide a likely setting for the promulgation of new canons. See below p. 197-200 and n. 89 for the problematic meaning of the term *vank‘* as well as p. 194-195 for the terminology of the VIth and VIIth century canons.

[59] Mahé (2000), p. 23-24, sees in these canons "une situation complexe, où se côtoient différents types de vie religieuse."See below n. 68.

[60] KH I, p. 450-451, "*Եթէ ոք ի Հաւատս կացցէ կամ միայնակեաց կամի լինել, զկուսութիւն և զսրբութիւն պահել և կենացն յաւիտենից Հասանել՝ ընդ ընկերս կացցէ ընդ ճշմարիտս և ընդ միաբանակեացս և ի միմեանց շաՀեսցին սիրովն Քրիստոսի, զի "Եղբայր*

Whereas canon xvi deals more specifically with ecclesiastical regulations:

> Whoever wishes to be a bishop, a spiritual leader [*aṙaǰnord*] and a shepherd, or built a *vanakan* or a hermitage [*anapat*] or desires the leadership of a district or villages or hermitages, let him listen to what is said "If greatness/wealth comes through pillage, do not seek it" [cf. Ps.61(62),11] …
> But whoever is the head bishop of the realm, let no one become a bishop without his will. And let no one dare become a *vanic‘ erēc‘* or a hermit [*anapatawor*] without [the permission] of the bishop of the district …[61]

In spite of the seeming clarity of these injunctions, however, the form in which these canons have come down to us presents a number of problems. As in the case of the *Canons* attributed to Nersēs II and Meršapuh, Hakobyan noted that the canons under consideration are missing from several of the manuscripts or are given a different reading[62]. Akinean further observed that far from being a cogent and well organized treatment of a particular point, canon xv, with its catalogue of virtues and injunctions against vices, such as keeping watch over one's words, the avoidance of usury … impudence, fornication, avarice, greed, lies, slander … ostentation, arrogance and so forth, before joining the brotherhood, is rather a diffuse homily replete with ecclesiastical *topoi* and biblical citations. Hence, he was of the opinion that both canons showed signs of later interpolations[63]. Going one step further, Mardirossian has recently argued that the canons were heavily reworked and interpolated in the VIIth century by the controversial theologian Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i whose writings were similarly characterized by a large admixture of scriptural quotations.[64]. Indeed, an analysis of the canons of Šahapivan, in the form in which they have come down to us, do not provide us with an

յեղբաւրէ աւգնեալ՝ իբրեւ զպարիսպ ամուր". և եթէ Աստուած բնակեցուցանէ զմիակրաւնս տան" և "Ուր երկու և երեք ժողովեալ են յանուն իմ, ես ի մէջ նոցա եմ" … Մի՛ լիցի սովորութիւն միայն լինել. ապա զիա՞րդ կարեն գիտել զկարգ և զպայման Հաւատոց, և կամ զյանցուած իւր ի միտ առնուլ, կամ զՀնազանդութիւնս և զսէր առ ընկերս ցուցանել:" See below n. 87 for the alternate reading of ms 659.

[61] Idem, p. 455, "*Որ եպիսկոպոս կամի լինել առաջնորդ և Հովիւ կամ վանական կամ անապատ շինել, և սաղարութեան ցանկանայցէ կամ գաւառի կամ գիւղից կամ անապատաց. լուիցէ զինչ ասեն. "Մեծութիւն թէ առիւ գայցէ՝ մի՛ յաւժարեսցիս"…:*

Բայց որ գլխաւոր եպիսկոպոսն աշխարՀին՝ առանց նորա կամաց եպիսկոպոս ոք մի՛ լիցի: Եւ վանաց երէց կամ անապատաւոր՝ առանց գաւառին եպիսկոպոսի չիշխէ լինել: See below n. 67 for the alternate reading of ms. 659. The term *vanic‘ erēc‘* seems to be a *hapax* in the Vth century, see below p. 201-203.‘

[62] Idem, p. 633-634.

[63] Akinean (1949), p. 128-131.

[64] Mardirossian (2004), p. 501,, "les vingt dispositions du synode …ont été lourdement interpolées par Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i, 508; also Id. (2006), p. 378 and n. 17, "Sur le plan juridique, Mayragomec‘i a composé une volumineuse compilation dans laquelle il a intégré en premier lieu le C*orpus de Šahapivan* lourdement interpolé".

unequivocal witness of the type of monasticism characterizing mid -Vth century Armenia, they rather reveal a confused mixture or deliberate reworking and distortion of the original text at a subsequent date.

The main consideration supporting such a conclusion is provided by the significant divergences in readings found in the Matenadaran ms. #659 dating from 1368, but which Hakobean considers to have preserved an earlier tradition than the one given in his edition[65]. These divergences confirm at several points the conclusion that in canons xv and xvi we are dealing with two layers of evidence relating to different periods only the older one of which relates to the actual period of the council, whereas the second belongs to the period of Mayragomec'i in the VIIth century. The superiority of ms. 659, which preserves some of the earlier tradition, manifests itself from its Introduction giving the far more plausible number of twenty bishops attending the council, rather than the forty, which aroused Akinean's suspicion as an impossibly large number at a time when the crucial council of Artašat called some five years later to defy the Sasanian authorities could muster only eighteen[66]. Similarly, canon xvi in ms 659 begins: "Whoever desires to be a bishop or a *vanac' erēc'* or a desert lover [*anapatasēr*] or [to have] the leadership over a district or villages …" a more coherent reading, which omits the incomprehensible "build a *vanakan" (* a term refering to an individual and not a structure) of the printed text[67]. Still more *i*mportantly, the technical terminology found in the canons, to which I shall soon return, likewise cannot be reconciled with the attribution of the existing text to single period.[68]

It is only with the Council of Duin of 644 /5 of which canon x addresses rather mildly:

> any of the *azat* who takes power over a *vank',* seizes and drives out the *vanakan* at will, which is neither proper nor lawful; and anyone who settles in a *vank'* with his household in contempt of the church of God with disrespectful shamelessness. If then [however], having heard this command, they grant to the *aṙaǰnord* the supervision of the church so as to order and

[65] Hakobyan, KH, I, p. lxxv-lxxvi.

[66] KH, I, p. 626, cf. Akinean (1949,) p. 97 ff; 102-103 and Mardirossian (2004), p. 504-506; cf. ŁP',I.xxiv, p. 44-45. The same number of bishops is given by E, p. 27-28, though in a different order.

[67] KH, I,xvi, p. 633, "[*Ո*]*ր եպիսկոպոս կամ վանաց երէց կամ անապատասէր կա՛մ սաղարութեան ցանկանայ կա՛մ գաւառի կա՛մ գիւղից…*". See above n. 61 for the reading in the printed version and below p. 197-201 and n. 89, for the term *vank'* and its derivative *vanakan*.

[68] Mahé (2000), p. 17, sees these canons as a mixture "en pleine évolution," but further analysis suggests rather a stratum preserving traces of the original Vth century text and a subsequent VIIth century reworking.

> establish it according to God's pleasure, let there be remission of the transgressions of their former deeds and let them be blessed by our unanimous council … [69];

whereas canon xii condemns:

> any of the *azat* of the non-noble [*ṙamik*] *horsemen* who coming somewhere to a village, and leaving the village take lodging in a *vank'* and under holy roofs and befoul with singers and dancing girls places dedicated to God, [a thing] which is appalling for Christians to hear, let alone do…[70]

that we may perhaps find some evidence for seemingly stable monastic institutions[71]. A testimony supported by the far more elaborate regulations of the *Canons* attributed to Saint Sahak, which bring us once again to the VIIth century.

Surprisingly, another crucial source of information, namely the technical terminology used in both the canons and, as we shall see, in the contemporary narrative sources has commonly been overlooked or interpreted without sufficient precision or consideration of its context. Therein lies one of the main causes of misunderstanding and error.

Some of the purportedly "monastic" terms found in the relevant early Armenian texts are purely descriptive and require little further elucidation. Such are the *anapatawor* or *anapatakan* "dweller in the desert" or again the *leṙnakan* "dweller on mountains"[72] Unfortunately the same cannot be said of the rest of their deceptively familiar vocabulary which does not support the hypothesis of early coœnobial foundations in Armenia though it has been interpreted too readily as relating to a developed form of monasticism such as characterized the late mediæval period.

[69] Duin 644/5, KH,II.x, p. 210-211, "*Ոմանք յազատաց ի վերայ վանաց իշխանութիւն առնեն և վանական՝ զոր կամին հանեն և արկանեն, զոր չէ արժան և աւրէն. և ոմանք ընտանեաւք ի վանքն նստին՝ արհամարհեալ զեկեղեցեաւն Աստուծոյ՝ անպատկառելի անամաւթութեամբ: Արդ՝ եթէ լուեալ մերոյ հրամանիս՝ դարձցին և թողցեն յառաջնորդս զտեսչութիւն եկեղեցւոյն կարգել և յաւրինել ըստ հաճոյիցն Աստուծոյ. այնպիսեացն յառաջագոյն գործելեաց յանցանացն թողութիւն լիցի և ի մեր միաբան ժողովոյս աւրհնեալ եղիցին …*"

[70] Ibid.,xii, p. 211-212, "*Ոմանք յազատաց և ռամիկ հեծելոց հասանելով ի գեաւղս ուրեք՝ թողեալ զգեաւղն ի վանն առնեն զիջավանսն և ի յարկս սրբոցն, և գուսանաւք և վարձակաւք պղծեն զնուիրեալ տեղիսն Աստուծոյ, զոր սոսկալի է քրիստոնէից լսել՝ թո՛ղ թէ առնել:…*"

[71] Even here, as in the earlier canons attributed to Nersēs and Meršapuh, the precise type of establishment referred to as a *vank,'* is not clear from the context. See below p. 200.

[72] NBHL I, p. 110, 883; BP-G, p. 506-507, s.n. *anapatawor…* See also below n. 77-78 for Syriac parallels..

As was noted earlier in the case of the companions brought by Saint Gregory from Sebaste, the term "brother [*ełbayr*]" is far too vague to be used exclusively, if at all, in the sense of "monk"[73]. The numerous problems and extensive recent discussions over the developing semantic content of the various Greek terms, μονάζων and μοναχός (in both their adjectival and nominal forms)[74] which are the equivalents of the numerous Armenian nouns, *mianjn, miaban, menak, miazon,* etc[75]. and the similar imprecisions in contemporary Syriac institutions noted by Canivet[76], do not authorize us *a priori* to render these terms invariably as "monks" rather than solitaries — hermits or anchorites. Nor should the numerous Syriac equivalents or even borrowings in the Armenian terminology be overlooked. Some of these parallels were already noted by Ter Minassiantz a century ago,[77] but were not given sufficient attention until the more extensive recent study of E. Mathews[78]. Not only is the Armenian *abełay* a direct adoption of the Syriac *abīlā ("mourner)*[79], but the just mentioned Armenian *anapatawor* and *leṙnakan,* as well as the various forms of "solitary", *menak, mianjn,* etc. are direct translations and equivalents of the Syriac, *madabārāyā, turāyā* and *îhīdāyā*[80]. This is all the more significant that the opening injunction of the xv canon of the Council of Šahapivan requires those who would seek eternal life to take on "virginity/chastity" (*kusut'iwn)* and "holiness" (*srbut'iwn*), the very virtues "virginity/ chastity/celibacy" (*betulā*) and "holiness" (*qaddīšūtā*) which characterize the Syriac *ihīdāyā*, who are celibate and/or solitary, occasionally grouped together, but without the necessary connotation of a stable, enclosed and regulated community[81]. Moreover, the quotation

73 See above p. 184-185.

74 *Inter alios,* Harl (1960);Baker (1968), p. 353; Morard (1973); Ead. (1980); Guillaumont (1979), p. 111-123.

75 NBHL, II, p. BP-G, p. 547.

76 Canivet (1977), p. 49-51. "La terminologie est fluctuante … les mêmes mots malgré leur apparence 'technique' peuvent recouvrire des réalités différentes". The religious schools referred to in Greek sources are, "des confréries d'ascètes plutôt que des monastères".

77 Ter Minassiantz (1904), p. 11-13.

78 Mathews (2005), p. 148 -150.

79 Ibid., who also notes p. 148 and n. 20 that the Syriac title *riš abîlê* "head of mourners" finds its exact counterpart in the *glux abełayic'* in the *Epic Histories,* VI.xvi.

80 Mathews (2005), p.148.

81 Vööbus (1958), I, p. 99-108 and 108 n. 194, quoting Ms.Vat.syr. 501 f.23b "and at time when the order gained strength and grew large they were called… in Greek μοναχοί and their dwelling places μοναστήρια which are interpreted in Syriac as the caves (or cells) of the *īhīdayē"*. Cf. Baker (1968), p. 348,-349; Murray (1975), p. 12-16; Canivet (1977), p. 49-59; Nedungatt (1973), p. 205-206; Guillaumont (1979), p. 113/218-

from Matth. 18,20 in the same canon, on two or three being gathered in the name of the Lord used by the canon in support of its injunction carries no obligatory suggestion of a building or enclosure. The repeated association of *mianjn* with *anapatawor* and *leaṙnakan* in the *Epic Histories* suggest that this term had the sense of "isolated hermit" rather than to that of "members of a sedentary community" which it would acquire in the future[82]. In addition to these Syrian parallels, Agat'angełos' detailing of the qualities and functions of the term *aṙaǰnord* found in canon xvi, as it applied to Saint Gregory,

> Overseer and teacher and leader in God's path and shepherd and doctor, according to the providential tradition and divine grace of Christ[83],

Indicate that this title had not progressed from the level of "spiritual leader" or "guide" to the more mundane and practical one of superior of a monastery.

Another term crucial for this investigation of the type of ascetic institutions found in early Christian Armenia, *uxt*, has a number of meanings from the merely secular "oath", as it appears occasionally in the *Epic Histories* interchangeably with *erdumn,* to the more evolved and specific meanings of "pact or covenant" and finally to its use as a synonym for the "clergy".[84] Its more common use in earlier sources, however, is that of the "covenant of the faith", and as such it is the equivalent of the Syriac *qyāmā*[85]. Similarly, the early Armenian formula, "the children/

115/219, "Le *monachos* est donc bien, primitivement, celui qui vit seul, qui est 'solitaire' si l'on veut, mais non pas parce qu'il vit dans la solitude du désert, loin des hommes, mais simplement parce qu'il n'a pas de femme. Le célibat est donc lié à l'essence préliminaire du monachisme. Le moine est d'abord l'ascète célibataire; [le] syriaque *ihidāyā* son équivalent exact … vivent au sein de la communauté des fidèles, ils se distinguent des autres fidèles par le fait qu'ils ont abandonné toute possession terrestre pour mener une vie errante,,, et aussi par le fait qu'ils ont renoncé au mariage pour garder la virginité" See also above p. 191 and n. 60, for, canon xv.

[82] E.g. BP, V,xxviii; VI.vi,xvi p. 226, 268-269, 274-276 = BP-G, p. 205, 207, 235, 239-240.

[83] Aa, dccci, p. 340-341, "*զԳրիգորդ տեսուչ և վարդապետ առաջնորդութեան աստուածագնաց ճանապարհացն, և հովիւ և բժիշկ կացուսջիք*"; cf. BP-G, p. 507-508, s.n.

[84] NBHL II, p. 541-542, "foedus, votum, pactum, clerus" BP occasionally uses the term in the sense of a secular oath and in conjunction with *erdumn*, III.xxi, p. 65 "*զուխտն յիշեալ զդաշանցն կռելոց զերդմանցն հաստատութեան*" = BP-G, p. 98, .IV,xv,xvi,xviii, xxiii, "*ուխտ երդմամբ*", liii, "*երդումն ուխտիւ*" V, xxxii, p. 126, 134, 136, 147, 170, 235 = BP-G, p. 141, 147, 148, 156, 170, 213. Its most common use there, however,is as the "covenant of the faith,"*զուխտ հաւատոյ*"III.v., p. 24 or the"holy covenant "*սուրբ ուխտն*", III,xi, p. 37, III,xiv,IV,ix,xiii,xxiv,li,V,xx,xliii,liv, p. 47, 99, 118, 150, 169, 217, 255, 259-260 = BP-G, p. 58, 72, 80, 87, 123, 136, 158, 169, 202, 226, 228-229. See also next notes.

[85] *The uxt hastatun* entered into by the bishops and princes at the Second Council of Duin in 555, which they signed with their hearts as well as their seals and withdrawal

sons of the covenant" (*uxti mankanc'*) corresponds to the *bnay*/*bnāt qyāmā*, with the same meaning, who are likewise known to early Syriac sources[86]. Significantly, this formula, which appears repeatedly in the early Armenian narrative texts, is also the one used in the earlier layer of the fifteenth canon of the council of Šahapivan as given in in ms. 659: "If anyone of the servants or of the children of the covenant (*uxtē mankanc')* [wishes] … to keep virginity and holiness and attain eternal life…". However, it was no longer meaningful to the later, reworked version found in the critical edition where it has has been replaced by the more general and imprecise *ok'* "anyone"[87]. In its earlier and specialized sense this formula is of the utmost importance for the present investigation both on account of its patent Syriac link and through its implication that the means of binding a community together was the covenant into which its members had entered rather than any physical enclosure.

Most troublesome in this connexion are the crucial terms *vank',* together with the noun derived from it *vanakan,* which are almost invariably rendered as "monastery" and "monk". There is no doubt that by the later Middle Ages *vank'* had indeed acquired the meaning of "monastery" and the dwellers therein or *vanakan* were "monks", but such an assumption is altogether unwarranted for the IVth, Vth and probably most if not all of the VIth centuries. The original meaning of the Armenian term *vank'* (derived from a lost Iranian form **vahana* OP *avahana* Sansk. v*asana*)

from which carried anathemata, was unquestionably an "unshakeable pact or covenant", GT' p. 202 (= Garsoïan, 1999, p. 479), and Łazar P'arpec'i undoubtedly uses it in this sense when he speaks of "the gospel of he covenant [*Awetarann uxtin*]", or of the supporters of Vardan Mamikonean as "those faithful to the covenant [*uxtapahk'n*]". ŁP', II.xxx,xxxvii, p. 58, 68 = ŁP'-T, p. 98, 110; cf. E, p. 3,54 = E-T, p. 57, 105, and Ibid., p. 9-11, and 57 n. 4. The old sense of "oath", did not disappear altogether since it is still clearly intended in the case of the penitent bishops making their peace with the katholikos Abraham I in 607, who were required to "swear with an oath [*erdmamb uxtesc'en*] publicly that they renounced their former heresy", GT', p. 294 (= Garsoïan, 1999, p. 508. However, it also appears with the sense of "the clergy"; see e.g., the *Canons* attributed to St. Sahak, KH, xxxviii, p. 394 = C, p. 841, and also the next note.

[86] Vööbus (1958), I, p. 99-100; Brock (1973), p. 7-8; Murray (1975). Like *uxt*, this formula or the related *surb uxt* and *amenayn uxt ekełec'woy* came increasingly to be taken as a designation for the clergy in general. See e.g. the *Second Letter of Babgēn katholikos*, ca. A.D. 508, GT', p. 157 (= Garsoïan, 1999, p. 446), or the *Canons* attrributed to Saint Sahak, KH,I, xxxviii, p. 394 (= C, p. 841). For a recent study of the children of the covenant which posits that this formula is "clearly connected with the Syriac *bbnay Q'yāmā*" (p. 261), but considers different aspects of the question, see Shirinian (2001-2002).

[87] KH, I, p. 633, "*Զի եթէ ոք ի պաշտաւնէից և* յուխտէ մանկանց (italics added) *ի հաւատս կայցէ, կամ մէնակեաց կամ զինչ և է կամ զսրբութիւն կամ զկուսութիւն պահել և կենացն յաւիտէնից հասել …*". See above n. 60 for the text of the critical edition.

was merely a "dwelling, residence lodging", without any religious implications[88]. The great Venetian Dictonary, the *Nor Bargirk‘ Haykazean Lezui*, prudently gives as its first meaning for the term, "*diversorium, hospitium, mansio, tabernaculum*" and only as a second meaning, "*monasterium,* λαῦρα"[89]. Similarly, its Syriac counterpart *dayrā* took on the specific meaning of a monastery only later. In early texts, it is still used in its general meaning of any dwelling — whether a man-made construct or not[90].

In the *Epic Histories* the "lodging" of the Roman sophist as well as those of the imperial officials in the city; the "residence" to which the poisoned patriarch Nersēs retired to die surrounded by the entire Armenian nobility which had followed him there; finally, the "house of the wardrobe" to which the eunuch Glak was taken for execution are all called *vank‘,* but they can hardly have been "monasteries"[91]. Whatever doubt there might be concerning the type of individual lodgings to which the Armenian nobles returned after taking a joint oath to defend the Christian faith, according to Łazar P‘arpec‘i,[92] there can be none concerning the various *vank‘*s to which the Armenian nobles returned on two occasions after a "merry banquet"[93]. In a still more revealing episode,

[88] BP-G, p. 566-567.

[89] NBHL, II, p. 783. The Armenian equivalents given in explanation for the first meaning are likewise entirely secular: "*օթեւան, իջաւան, բնակարան, կայան, դադարք, վրան, Հիւրանոց, փարախ, տաղաւար*".

[90] Vööbus (1958),, p. 222, notes that *dayrā* is used by Aphraat in its primitive meaning of "sheepfold", habitation and not in that of "monastery". Nedungatt (1973), p. 204; Mathews (2005), p. 150 and n. 38.

[91] BP, IV,x, p. 110. "*…արտաքոյ քաղաքին վկայանոց մի սուրբ տիկնոջն Թեկղի: …էՋ սոփիստէս և իւր վանս ունէր ի ներքս ի վկայանոցի անդ. բայց մագիստրիանոսքն ունէին վանս իւրեանց ի քաղաքին*" = BP-G p. 131. The sophist chose to "lodge" in a martyrion, but the "lodging" of his companions in the city must have been secular, yet the same term is used in both cases; V.xxiv, p. 221"*… և յարուցեալ գնաց ի վանս իւր: Եւ զՀետ գնացին նորա ի տաճարէն արքունի ամենայն մեծամեծքն նախարարքն Հայոց, … Եւ … եմուտ ի վանս իւր …*" = BP-G, p. 204; BP, V.vi, p. 209-210, "*… և տանէին զնա (Գլակ) մինչև ի դուրս տաճարին արքունի: Իսկ … թագաւորն … ասէ. Մի՛ այսր, մի՛ այսր այլ մուծէք զնա ի տուն պատմուճակացն: … և անդէն ի վանսն պատմուճակացն փողոտեցին զնա, և Հատին գլուխ նորա, և Հանին Հարին ի նիզակի, և կանկնեցին ի Հրապարակին արքունի:* " = BP-G, p. 197.

[92] ŁP‘, III.lxvi, p. 120, "*Եւ այսպէս երդուեալք ի գիչերին և Հաստատեալք ի Հաւատն Քրիստոսի և Հրաժարեալք ի միմեանց՝ յիւրաքանչիւր վանս գնացին Հանգչել:*" = ŁP‘-T, p. 174. And it should be noted that among those returning to their own *vank‘s* were included the former apostates, as is explicitly noted by the historian, "*քրիստոնեայքն և ուրացեալքն*", Idem.

[93] ŁP‘, III,xc, p. 162, "*… և տեսեալ Նիխորոյ զՀայերն, որ չոքան առ նա … ամենայժար սրտիւ խնդութեամբ ուրախացաւ: Եւ Հրաման տուեալ ընթրեացն՝ ընկալաւ զնոսա բազում գոՀութեամբ և յոյժ սիրով, յիշելով Հանապազ ըստ ամենայն բաժակի զքաՋ*

Ełišē depicts the Persian king ordering his chief-executioner to guard the captive Armenian nobles in "each one's lodging [*vank'*][94]. He, moreover, systematically uses *vank'* in a purely secular sense, for the locale to which the Persian magi flee to escape the infuriated Armenians, as well as for the lodgings of the commander-in chief, both of which Thomson has reasonably translated respectively as "camp" and "quarters"[95]. The alternation of the terms *vank'* and *mianjanoc'* in the *Epic Histories* without any suggestion that they were not synonymous points in the case of the first to a sense of "hermitage" rather than of "monastery"[96].

Łazar P'arpec'i refers to the religious life desired by Maštoc' as a *karg vanakanut'ean,* which he achieves by entering a large *vank'* with many brothers [*ełbark'*][97]. However, Maštoc''s disciple Koriwn says that his master had entered *"i miaynakec'akan karg."*, that is to say the ranks of ascetics or hermits[98]. Again, the holy man from Tełk' who was supposed to have shielded the Armenian magnates is said by Łazar P'arpec'i to have lived alternately in a *vank'* or a "hermitage/desert" [*anapat*], together with two young companions, presumably grooms, responsible for provisions and horses, and he is identified as both a *vanakan* and a priest [*k'ahanay*][99]. Under such circumstances, just as in

Մամիկոնեանն Վահան. և կատարեալ զուրախալից ընթրիսն՝ գնային յիւրաքանչիւր վանս:" = ŁP'-T, p. 222; III,xciii, p. 169, "*Եւ ուրախացեալք այն օր ըստ օրին ի մեծապէս ընթրեաց, և Հրաժարեալք ի Նիխորոյ՝ գնացին Հանգչել ի վանս իւրաքանչիւր:*" = ŁP'-T, p. 230.

[94] E, p. 48, "*Եւ վաղվաղակի Հրամայէք զպատուական նախարարսն Հանել մեծաւ անարգանօք յերեսաց իւրոց. և զգուշութեամբ Հրաման տուեալ դաՀճապետին՝ արանց կապանաց յիւրաքանչիւր վանս պաՀել,*" = E-T, p. 99. The suggestion that the Sasanians had "monasteries" in their realm for the detention of the captive Armenian nobles is particularly ludicrous.

[95] E, p. 58, "*Քանզի վիրգս ի ձեռն առեալ՝ զկառափունս մոգացն և մոգպետին ջարդեցին. փախստական յիւրաքանչիւր վանս անկանէին,*" = E-T, p. 110; E, p. 65, "... *սուրբ եպիսկոպոսունքն ... Հասին և անկան ... ի վանս սպարապետին ... ... Իսկ որ էին ներքս ի վանս սպարապետին՝ յոտն կացին ...*" = E-T, p. 116 and Thomson, ŁP'-T, p. 270-271.

[96] For instance, he speaks of the holy man Epip'an returning to his own *vank'*, V.xxvii, p. 226, "*և դառնայր ինքն ի յիւր վանսն*"= BP-G, p. 207, and follows immediately with a reference to Epipan's own *mianjnanoc'*, BP, V.xxviii, p. 227, "*գնայր սուրբ Եպիփան ի գաւառէն Ծոփաց յիւրմէ միանձնանոցէն*" = BP-G, p. 207.

[97] ŁP', I.x, p. 13, "... *տենչացեալ կարգի վանականութեան՝ երթայ ի վանս բազմութեան եղբարց, և ընկալեալ զկերպարանս վանականութեան՝...*" ŁP-T, p. 47.

[98] K, vi, p. 38, "*ի միայնակեցական կարգ մտանէր*". See below, p. 212 and nn. 159-160, for the identical practices described by both authors.

[99] ŁP',III.lxxvii, p. 141-142, "*կացեալ ի վերայ մեր ... առն միոյ քաՀանայի Հոգեւորի ի Տեղանց անապատէ, ... Երթեալ այնուՀետև ի վանկունս իւր՝ բերէր մեզ կերակուր ինչ դուզնակեալ և ջուր, ածեալ ընդ իւր և մանուկ մի միւս ... Թողեալ առ մեզ զմանուկն, գնայր ի մէնջ ի վանկունսն իւր: Եւ ի միւսում ևս գիշերին ածեալ զրաստ, միւս եւս այլ մանկամբ՝*

the case of *mianjn*, the use of either *vank‘* or *vanakan* in an early text cannot be taken safely as an index of the contemporary presence of monastic foundations and must be constantly controlled and re-defined according to the context in which they appear.

The evolution of the term in the direction of a religious connotation is not clear and remains ambiguous at least to the VIIth century. In the second half of the VIth century, the *vank‘*s, into which no woman (be she a baker, milkmaid or butter churner) might be admitted, and the ones where solitaries must obligatorily seek shelter according to the *Canons of Nersēs and Meršapuh,*[100] must have housed some sort of religious communities, but this does not imply automatically that they were establishments of conœbial type. Both the Syrian *ihīdāyā* and, as we shall see, early Armenian "consecrated virgins" lived together within ordinary larger settlements without forming isolated "monastic" communities[101]. As such these canons do not provide us with any secure evidence that the meaning of *vank‘* had evolved beyond that of a dwelling for the communal life of consecrated inmates to a more elaborate and organized complex.

By the middle of the VIIth century, the *vank‘*s into which the noble *azats* settled with their households, having driven out the legitimate inhabitants (*vanakan)*, or into which they even more shamelessly introduced singers and dancing girls, "befoul[ing] places dedicated to God," according to the *canons* of the Council of 644/5, are unquestionably religious dwellings, but even here, we are not given any indication as to their form nor is the title of their superior, *aṙaǰnord* a sign of anything more precise than spiritual leadership[102]. The ambiguous *Canons* erroneously attributed to Saint Sahak and presumably of the same later period[103] are far more elaborate but by no means clearer for our purpose[104]. According

… տանէին յանապատ, ուր ինքեանք բնակեալ էին …: Եւ սուրբ վանականս ընդ բազում անապատ տեղիս և ընդ բազում խորաձորս քարանձաւաց շրջեցուցանէ զմեզ ի ծածուկ …:" = ŁP-T, p. 199-200.

[100] KH I, xxxiii, p. 489 (= M, 32, p. 276), " *Եւ մի՛ ամենեւին … Հացարար և կովկիթ կամ խնոցահար ի վանսն տանել կին մարդ, զի թէ ուր չէր նմա հնար մտանել՝ կործանեաց զմարդն, ապա զիւրսն զինչ իսկ առնէ:*" Idem,I, xxxiv, p. 490 (= M, 34, p. 276), "*…Իսկ մոնազունք և վանաց մանկունք վանս մի՛ ոք իշխեսցեն ուրեք ունել բայց ի վանս, ապա եթէ վանք չկան՝ յաւագ երիցուն տան երթիցեն. զի չէ իշխանութիւն յայլ տան աւթել.*" This is corroborated by the *Canons of Saint Sahak,* KH, I,xl, p. 398-399 (= C.p. 842).

[101] See above p. 196-197 and n. 84; below p. 209 and n. 144.

[102] See above nn. 69-70 for the text of the canons of 644/5 and n. 83 for the title *aṙaǰnord.*

[103] See above nn. 54-55, for then date and authenticity of these *Canons.*

[104] The canons are curiously composite, alternating between specific elaborate directions as to the duties of bishops or chorepiscopi or the benefits due to *vank‘s,* and lengthy

to them, the *vank'*s were also unquestionably religious buildings of unspecified type possessing notable estates in return for their spiritual services and hospitality. Their inmates were clearly distinguished from married priests and their rights to specific benefits spelled out[105]. They were said to be similar to those erected by the Greeks, the Romans and the Syrians, but their introduction was attributed, beyond any possibility of verisimilitude, to Gregory the Illuminator[106]. Furthermore, they seem to have been located in villages rather than in the isolated sites characteristic of almost all later monasteries[107]. Insofar as their authenticity can be trusted, then, the terminology and information of the VIIth century canons, may perhaps foreshadow a new stage in Armenian monasticism, but they cannot be identified with its later, fully developed form.

Of particular interest in this context is the term *vanic'/vanac' erēc'* ("priest/elder" of a *vank'*), which appeared as a *hapax* in the sixteenth canon of the Council of Šahapivan where it may well reflect the reworking of the text in the VIIth century rather than the original stratum, and which gradually appears thereafter in the Armenian sources[108]. To my knowledge the term does not occur elsewhere in the Vth century. Nor does it appear at the beginning of the next century, with reference to

disquisitions, such as canon xxxvi, KH. I, p. 386-391 (= partial, C IV.v, p. 841),whose concern seems to be the definition of the true "church" as the community of the believers rather than as an actual structure, although reverence was also due to the actual church building.

[105] KH,I, xxxviii, p. 394-395 (= C IV.iv, p. 841), "*Եւ որք ամուսնութեանն են պարապեալ քահանայք՝ բազում անգամ պատաղին ի մշակութիւն, և կանանց իւրեանց հնարին լինել հաճոյ … Իսկ ի վանեարն բնակեալք՝ կուսութեամբ են պարկեշտացեալք միշտ … զխաղաղութեան խնդրելով ամենայն աշխարհի, և զգեղջն շինութիւն …. Վասն այնորիկ ազատ յամենայն հարկապահանջ իշխանաց՝ սահմանս ընկալաւ և անդս …*"

[106] Ibid., p. 393-394 (= C, IV.iv, p. 840-841), "…*որպէս կամ յինչ պատճառս շինեցան վանք, քանզի այսմ ոչ եթէ Հայոց միայն ազգս կալաւ փոյթ յանձին, այլ և Յոյնք և Հոռոմք և Ասորիք, և այլ ամենայն ազգք ի Քրիստոս հաւատացելոց՝ զոր և երիցս երանեալն քաջ նահատակն Քրիստոսի Գրգորիոս՝ կատարեաց շնորհելով նմա ի Հոգւոյն սրբոյ զաւգուտ մատակարարութեանն: Քանզի բազմապատիկ աւգտի է առիթ և սիւն հաստատութեան ճշմարտութեան ուխտի մանկանց.*, …" See also preceding note *in fine*.

[107] Idem, p. 394 (= C,IV,iv, p. 841), "*Վասն այսորիկ իսկ և դիպողագոյն եղաւ անուն վանք, զի անտրտում որոց պիտոյ իցէ՝ տացեն. և ոչ միայն առ աւտարս է աւգուտ նոցա յաճախեալ, այլ առաւել ևս գեաւղջն յորում շինեցաւ, քանզի աւրէն է նոցա սփոփել զհիւանդս և մխիթարել զզգաւորս:*". These establishments located within settlements, to whose welfare they were dedicated, seem more reminiscent of Saint Nersēs' earlier scattered philanthropic foundations (see above p. 181-182 and n. 15) than of the intellectual pursuits and isolation of the later great monasteries. With the exception of the religioujs cemter of Ējmiacin, later Armenian monasteries are not to be found in urban centers, but rather in the "desert [*anapat*]".

[108] See above p. 192-193 and n. 61-68.

Armenian participants at the first Council of Duin of 505/506, which mentions exclusively "solitaries" *vanakank‘* and *miaynaceal monazeanc‘*[109]. It is used there only in the case of one Syrian members of the mission from Persia, including Symeon the future bishop of Bet Aršam, who is designated as a *vanac‘ erēc‘*[110]. Only the katholikos, prince Vard Mamikonean and other nameless princes and *naxarar*s sign the official letter sent by the Armenians to Persia[111]. Similarly, the second *Letter* of the katholikos to the *vanakanc‘* of Persia mentions only bishops and the "entire *uxt* of our holy church" on the Armenian side[112]. Even in the middle of the century, the term is primarily used in connexion with Syrians. Thus the first *Letter of the orthodox Syrians to the Armenians* is sent in the name of a series of *vanic‘ erēc‘*s none of whom are Armenians, though one of them, the Julianist Abdišoy, would be consecrated "bishop of the orthodox Syrians" in Armenia and participate in the Council of 555[113]. Indeed, the actual positions of the writers and members of this mission from Mesopotamia is not clear, since one of them is identified as a stylite, another as the "priest of the *vank‘*" and still others as the "priest of solitaries [*k‘ahanay miaynnakeac‘*]", the "deacon of a *vank‘* [*sarkawag i vanic‘*]", and in general as the "servants/ministers [*spasawork‘* or *paštoneayk‘*] of a *vank‘*"[114]. Approximately the same, though slightly abbreviated, list of Syrians is given in the salutation of the *Answer* of Nersēs II, who mentions only bishops, priests, *vanakank‘* and the *uxt* of the holy church among those present on the Armenian side at the ordination of Abdišoy[115]. Abdišoy uses similar general terms in his first *Letter* as bishop, still underscoring the fact that greetings were

[109] GT‘, p. 148, "… *բերելով զողջոյն, յաստուածապաշտ և ուղղափառ ճգնաւորաց եկեղեցւոյ, երիցանց և վանականաց և միայնացեալ մոնազանց*, … " cf. 149 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 439-441 and 438 n. 11.

[110] GT‘, p. 149, "*Սամուէլ ՄաՀարձոյ վանաց երէց ի Կարմիկան նաՀանգէ*," = Garsoïan (1999), p. 441, cf. Ibid., p. 153 = 444.

[111] Ibid., p. 155-156 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 446.

[112] GT‘, p. 157 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 446.

[113] GT‘, p. 176, 181, 184, 201 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 460, 465, 478.

[114] GT‘, p. 172, "*Դանիէլ վանից երէց և Սիւնական Սարեբայի, Գաբրիէլ վանից երէց Ովփեսի, և Եղիա սիւնական և վանից երէց Սուսինայի* and ten more *զի այլ երիցունք և սարկաւագունք զաւառիս եկեղեցեաց, և վանից սպասաւորք*, …" = Garsoïan (1999), p. 457. GT‘, p. 174, "*ԱՀարոն վանից երէց ՄարՀալայի, Դաւիթ վանից երէց Խափայի, Յակոբ քաՀանայ ի վանաց Սարեբայի, Նոյ վանից երէց Կենայի, Բրիխիսոյ քաՀանայ միայնակեաց, Սէթ պաշտաւնեայ Տամոքա, Դաւիթ վանից երէց Փարթնայի, և Եղիա, և Յովսէփ ի նմին վանաց Սարեբայի, և Դաւիթ սարկաւագ ի վանաց Բղնայի, և Սերգիս երէց գեղջ Մարտի:*" = Garsoian (1999), p. 459.

[115] GT‘, p. 176, 180 "*ամենայն եպիսկոպոսաւք աշխարՀիս, Հանդերձ քաՀանայիւք և վանականաւք և ուխտիւս սրբոյ եկեղեցւոյ*," = Garsoïan (1999), p. 460, 463.

being sent from Mesopotamia to Armenia by "the holy churches, the *vanic' eric'unk'* and all the believers of this realm"[116].

Only in Abdišoy's next *Letter* do we find for the first time his greeting to the Armenians detailing explicitly all the bishops, priests, *vanic' eric'anc'*, and all the *uxt*s of the holy church in your country[117]. These do not, however, seem to have participated in the covenant of the second Council of Duin in 555, where *vanakan*s are present but only the bishops and princes sign the binding *uxt*. It is only with the second half of the VIth century, in Nersēs II's post conciliar *Letter* to the bishops of Mardpetakan and Arcunik', and in his successor, Yovhannēs II's, *Letter* to Siwnik' that we find unquestionable mentions of *vanic' eric'unk'* in Armenia[118]. These, however, are neither named nor localized, as is the case for the Syrians. The title seems to have become established only with the opening of the VIIth century where we find in the documents pertaining to the election of Abraham I in 607 a list of *vanac' erēc'k'* each with the name of the foundation which he headed, an indication which, as we have seen, is confirmed by the contemporary *Letter* of the bishop of C'urtaw[119]. It occurs likewise in the VIIth century *History* attributed to Sebēos[120] and in the earlier portion of the *History of the Albanians* referring to the same period[121].

The one piece of external evidence which might seem to allude to stable monastic structures as early as the first half of the Vth century comes from the famous *Tome to the Armenians* sent by the patriarch of Constantinople Proclus to Saint Sahak the Great, but it too will not

[116] GT', p. 181, 183, "*ողջոյն տան ձեզ սուրբ եկեղեցիքս և վանաց երիցունք, և ամենայն հաւատացեալք աշխարհիս*" (emphasis added) = Garsoïan (1999), p. 464-465.

[117] GT', p. 184, "*այլ եպիսկոպոսաց աշխարհիդ, վանաց երիցանց, կաՀանայից և ամենայն ուխտից սրբոյ եկեղեցւոյ…*" (emphasis added) = Garsoian (1999), p. 466

[118] GT', p. 201-202 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 477-479. GT', p. 205, "*Դուք, տեարք, վանից երիցանց քաՀանայից և Համայրէն ժողովրդականաց … որք մերձաւորք և որք Հեռագոյնք են ի ձէնջ, Հրաման դուք …*", 207 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 480, 485

[119] GT', p. 298-299, "… *Ներսէս Վանանդայ եպիսկոպոս, Հանդերձ վանից երիցամբքս այսոքիւք, Աբրաham սրբոյ կաթուղիկէի վանից երէց, Սամուէլ սրբոյ Հռիփսիմէի, Բաբիլաս սրբոյ Յովհաննու վանաց երէց, Խոսրով Աւշականու, Յաւիտեան Եղիւարդայ, Դաւիթ Երեւանայ, և Իսմայէլ Գառնոյ, Յունանէս Աւանի, Իսրայէլ Պաղաւանից, Ջոջիկ Արամունից,Յովհանիկ Արտաւազդայ ապարանից, Աբաս և Որդեակ և Աբրաham Փարպիոյ, Միքայէլ Աղցից, Գրիգորիս Արճոյ, Կոզմաս Ուրդայ և Մայէն միւս Արճոյ, Յովհանիկ Արծափաց, Սիմոն Դարունից, Սամոտ Բագարանի, և այլ վանից երիցամբ Հանդերձ, եկեալ յանդիման մեր* …" = Garsoïan (1999), p. 514. See above p. 189-190 and n. 52, for the *Letter* of Movsēs of C'urtaw and 53 for the council of 607..

[120] S, xxxvii, p. 77 = S-T, I, p. 121.

[121] MK-D, xx, p. 65, "*զվանաց երէց գեղջն*" = M-D, p. 37, where it is translated "the abbot [sic] of the village". See above p. 190-191, n. 57, for the problem of dating this compilation.

withstand closer scrutiny. Its salutation: "To the venerable and pious bishops, priests and archimandrites in all Armenia"[122], occurs only in the Greek version and in none of the others. The unquestionably monastic title "archimandrite" which it contains is found exclusively in the title and not in the body of the text, and it implies a highly developed monastic hierarchy of which we find no trace in early Vth century Armenia. Furthermore, the geographical definition "in all Armenia" is far too broad and cannot be reconciled with the contemporary historical setting in which, not only was Imperial Armenia separated from the Persarmenian territories in which the Armenian patriarch had his residence, but Saint Sahak, exiled to his own domain of Bagrewand by the king of kings Bahram V and replaced by a series of anti-patriarchs, was in no position to exercise his authority even over the full extent of his legitimate jurisdiction[123] in Greater Armenia. Without going into further details, therefore, the evidence that can be drawn from ecclesiastical terminology shows a significant early correspondence with a Syriac, rather than a Greek milieu, and once again does not support a date before the VIIth century for the presence of monasticism in any strict sense..

If we now turn to the sources on which studies of early Armenian monasticism have been based, the so–called *History of Tarōn* is probably the most egregious example, but if we omit obviously later sources describing a situation different from the one concerning us here, some of the presumably contemporary material available also requires further reexamination. The *Yačaxapatum čaṙkʻ* or *Occasional Homilies*, of which the twenty-third and last deals extensively with monasticism, has been traditionally attributed to saint Gregory the Illuminator, but not only has the authenticity of this last homily been challenged, but its citation of one of the canons of the Council of Chalcedon dates it considerably later. J.-P. Mahé further noted that its citation of the Armenian version of the Hermes Trismegistos cannot antedate the VIth century[124]. Equally

[122] ACO IV.ii, p. 187, "Τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις καὶ θεοσεβεστάτοις ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίταις τοῖς οὖσι κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀρμενίαν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας Πρόκλος ἐν κυρίῳ χαίρειν" Cf. Garsoïan (1999), p. 87-88.

[123] Ibid., p. 58-60, 62-65, 119-121. See above p. 184, for the contemporary subdivisions of Armenia.

[124] Y; Hacʻuni (1930); Maksoudian (1982), p. 508-509; who estimates that the work could not have been written before the early part of the Vth century. see also R. Young's unpublished paper which she had the kindness to make available to me; and in which she opts for a probable late Vth early VIth century date, p. 10. The presumed Gregorian authorship is readily dismissed by Thomson (2001), p. 16 n. 29, who rightly observes that "The attribution of these homilies to Gregory is fanciful since they were composed in Armenian"; Mahé (2000), p. 22 and n. 76, identifies this work as "un pseudépigraphe du

doubtful is the treatise, *Yałags mianjanc‘* attributed to Ełišē, which may be a version of Philo's *De vita contemplativa* concerning the Therapeutae, and may again date from the VIIth century[125] In the case of the disputed dates of some of the narrative sources, the most notorious of which is unquestionably the *History of Armenia* of Movsēs Xorenac‘i, their information concerning the early period must necessarily remain unreliable until the *vexata quaestio* of their chronological position can finally be resolved, as has been done for Ps. Yovhannēs Mamikonean[126].

The early Armenian narrative sources whose dating, and consequently contemporary testimony, seem to be reasonably relevant and trustworthy for the period of the IVth to the VIIth centuries, are well known. For the earliest period: Koriwn's mid Vth century *Life of Maštoc‘,* the Agat‘angełos *Cycle* in its many versions, though it may have been reworked in the VIth century[127], the late Vth century *Epic Histories*; the *History of Armenia* and the *Letter to Vahan Mamikonean* of Łazar P‘arpec‘i at the very end of the same century, and Ełišē's *History of Vardan and the Armenian war.* For the VIIth century, we have the *History* of the Pseudo-Sebēos and with considerable precautions, the

VIe siècle" on the basis of its citation of the Armenian version of Hermes Trismegistos which cannot be dated earlier. The elaborate monastic hierarchy comprising both a "spiritual leader" [*aṙajnord*] and a separate "superior"or "overseer" [*verakac‘u*], whose duties "require that he manage the brotherhood and mediate between the monks and their leader" and "directly under the superior in the *vank‘'s* chain of command is the "manager" [*tntesn*] 'who is reckoned … steward [*matakarar*]', etc." Young (s.d.), p. 11-17, is characteristic of a developed monasticism of whch we can find no trace in Armenia before VIIth century at the earliest Furthermore, he insistance on stability and the severe punishment mandated for a brother who breaks the injunction of the Chalcedonian canon that, "a brother will not be able to go out where he wishes, without the will of the superior and the brotherhood" Ibid., p. 13-14, 15-16, run directly counter to all the evidence we have of the peripatetic nature of Early Amenian asceticism, and to the canons specifying the times when hermits might leave and return to their dwellings, or seek shelter outside. See below. p. 210-214 and n. 166.

125 E?-M. For the attribution of this work to various authors of the same name, see Mahé (2000), p. 103-104 and n. 388; Mardirossian (2004), p. 15, n. 31. Outtier, E?-M trans. (1997), p. 97, dates it on stylistic grounds in the second half of the Vth century, that is as belonging to a period preceding the so-called Hellenophile school, whose own date, however, remains disputed. However, Idem p. 101, he further notes that M.E. Lucchesi called his attention to the parallels with the *De vita contemplativa*, and adds, "Ces rapprochements sont incontestables pour la première partie de l'Exhortation. On peut alors concevoir celle-ci comme une réaction chrétienne à la publication de la version arménienne d'un traité de Philon" and admits that the work's date remains uncertain.

126 The majority of western scholars place Xorenac‘i's *History* in the latter part of the VIIIth century. See, most recently, Garsoïan (2003-2004), as such, his information is neither contemporary nor altogether reliable for the earlier period and I have deliberately omitted references to it. See above p. 189 and n. 50 for the dating of Ps. Yovhannēs.

127 Adontz (1970), p. 254-258.

History of the Albanians[128]. To these should be added the *List of Armenian Monasteries in Jerusalem* attributed to Anastas *vartabed* and some episcopal *Letters,* all but one preserved in the *Book of Letters (Girk‘ Tłt‘oc‘)*[129].

Even here, care must be taken to analyse correctly the semantic content of the technical vocabulary used by the authors to describe "monastic" institutions and its context, since some passages have been taken as evidence for the early appearance of a developed, sedentary stage of monasticism, though such interpretations seem questionable on further examination. For example, both Koriwn and Łazar P‘arpec‘i speak of foundations over the tombs of Saints Sahak and Maštoc‘, respectively at Aštišat and Ōšakan[130]. Koriwn merely says that Maštoc‘'s disciples Yovsēp‘ and T‘adik, whom he calls a "prudent and pious man", together with "brothers" were appointed to the "service" of the saint, while in the case of Sahak, nothing was set up a the tomb, but that all came there once a year in his memory[131]. Writing approximately half a century later, Łazar P‘arpec‘i is considerably more prolix in the case of Saint Sahak:

> Taking the saint's precious relics, with a host of priests [*k‘ahanayic‘*] and notables [*azatac‘*] they brought them to then province of Tarawn, to his on native village called Aštišat. There they constructed the saint's tomb … They founded at the spot a monastery [*vank‘*] for a large number of ministers [*paštōnēic‘*], providing liberally for the comfort of the increased brotherhood [*ełbayrut‘eann*]. They established at that place annual gatherings with a great crowd of people, when at the appropriate time in vast throngs the nobility and priesthood … would enthusiastically assemble to celebrate the appointed [feast] day. They gained many cures, … and with joyful heart would return each to his own dwelling[132].

[128] Aa, BP, ŁP, E, S,K-MD. See above n. 57, for the compilatory nature of this last work and it probable date.

[129] Anastas, *vardapet,* GT‘.as indicated *ad loc.*

[130] K, xxiv.xxvi, p 96, ŁP‘, I.xviii, p. 37-38 = ŁP‘-T, p. 73.

[131] K. xxvi, p. 94, 96, "*…և ամենայն սրբովք ի միասին գումարելովք զմարմին … երանելոյն Մաշթոցի ի Հանգիստ խորանին փոխէր: Եւ զնորին աշակերտ Թադիկ անուն, զայր զգաստ և բարեպաշտօն Հանդերձ եղբարք, … սպասաւոր սրբոյն ի փառս Աստուծոլ կարգէին*"; xxiv, p. 88, "*ձեռնասուն աստուածասէր պաշտօնէիցն իւրոց, որոց զլխաւորին Երեմիա անուն ճանաչէր, այր սուրբ և բարեպաշտօն, … ի Տարօն Հասուցանէին … և զօրինաւոր յիշատակն ի վերայ կատարեալ, այնուՀետեւ իւրաքանչիւրն դառնային: Որոց և նոյնպէս ամի ամի գումարելովք նոյն ամսեան՝ զնոյն յիշատակն տօնախմբեն:*"

[132] ŁP‘, I.xviii, p. 37-38, "*Որոց առեալ զտենչալի նշխարս սրբոյն, բազմութեամբ քաՀանայից և ազատաց, տարան ի գաւառն Տարօնոյ, ի բնիկ գիւղն իւր սեպՀական, յանուանեալն Աշտիշատ. և անդ կազմեալ զՀանգստարանն սրբոյն՝ …: … Հիմնացուցեալ կանգնեցին ի տեղւոջն վանս բազմութեան պաշտօնէից, կարգեալ դարման անպակաս պտղոց ի Հանգիստ առաւելեալ եղբայրութեանն . Ժողովս տարեորականս աշխարՀայորդոր*

It has been argued that these are incipient or proto-monasteries. However, in the face of the vague references to "brothers" and "ministers", whom Koriwn specifically identifies with the disciples of the saint delegated to his service [*spasawor*], the total absence of any of the terms normally rendered "monks"[133] and of the general sense of the term *vank'* in this period, the impression given in both cases is of an indefinite number of attendants, religious or not, possibly forming some sort of confraternity, whose main purpose was to attend to the wants of pilgrims come from afar in order to participate in the commemorative services at the tomb of the saint.

Particularly noted is the reference in Łazar P'arpec'i's *Letter to Vahan Mamikonean* to the *vank'* of the cathedral at Vałaršapat of which he accepted the care or supervision (*xnamac'ēr*) and his complaints of the slander of "jealous men" [*č'aranaxanj mardkan*] against whom he sought to defend himself to his patron[134]. Elsewhere in the *Letter,* Łazar speaks again of "Łazar's *vank'*" and of the "monkdom" [*abełeank'*] who slandered him[135]. Here once more the possibility of a proto-monastery presents itself at first, but once again does not seem to fit the circumstances[136]. Interestingly, Łazar does not use the customary terminology for his enemies, but resorts to the unusual Syriac term *abełay*, which is not used by any of the contemporary sources with a single exception in the *Epic Histories*[137]. Even more curious is his comment "Would then the monkdom of Armenia not deserve tears of lamentations and great mourning that such inanities were spread abroad", which begins startlingly like a gloss on the Syriac term *abila* "weeper, mourner"[138] He further refers

բազմութեամբ հաստատեցին ի տեղւոջն, որ ըստ ժամանակի բազմամբոխ ժողովրդօք կամաւոր յօժարութեամբ ազատք և քահանայք … դիմեալք յօր կարգադրութեան նորա կատարեն: Որ և բազում օգնականութիւնս առողջութիւնս … շահէին … և ուրախալից սրտիւ դառնային ի բնակութիւն իւրաքանչիւր: "= ŁP-T, p. 73.

133 Norehad in his translation of Koriwn, xnxvi, p. 94 = K-N, p. 50) speaks of "the assembled monks", but the reading of the text is "the assembled saints,[*ամենայն սրբովք ի միասին գումարելովք*]", see above n. 131.

134 ŁP' *Ep*. p. 186, "*Կամեցեալ մեծի իմաստութեանն Վահանայ մարզպանին … տեառն Մամիկոնէից… շնորհէր նմա (Ղազարին) զհոյակապ և զականաւոր տեղին ի Նոր քաղաքի, որում աքնուն էր սուրբ Կաթողիկէ եկեղեցի, վանօքն. և նորա ընկալեալ զբանն մարզպանին՝ խնամածէր զտեղին*" ŁP'-T, p. 248, whose translation differs slightly from mine; Idem "*չարանախանձ մարդկան*".

135 Idem, p. 195, "*Ղազարայ վանք*" = ŁP'-T, p. 257. ŁP', p. 190, "*աբեղեանք Հայոց*", cf. 200, 202 = ŁP'-T, p. 252, who translates here "monk", cf. Idem, p. 269.

136 Mahé (2000), p. 18-22

137 ŁP'-T, p. 269.

138 ŁP', *Ep.*, p. 190 "*Եւ չիցե՞ն արդեօք աբեղեանս Հայոց արժանի ողբոց արտասուաց և բազում սգոյ*" = ŁP', p. 252. For ab̲īlē "mourners", see Aphraat, *Dem.* xiv, "He is the

to his slanderers as "foolish and insignificant men"[139]. The Akit' whom he cites as a witness in his own defense and who comes "from the *vank'* of Gardman" is also described merely as "a man" [*ayr mi*] with no suggestion that he was anything but an ordinary layman[140].

Łazar boasts of his own renown in the churches, martyria, and "places of holy learning [*tełik vardapetarank'*]", but does not mention any place that might be identified as a monastic community[141]. In his description of the rebuilding of the cathedral at Vałaršapat by Vahan Mamikonean, Łazar notes the martyria of the virgin saints but mentions no other building besides the church itself. On the contrary he speaks of "the *vank'* of the holy cathedral", as though they formed a single complex[142]. Consequently, what is presented here seems to be a group of men attached to the service of the cathedral, possibly religious — as would be western canons — or even laymen, perhaps joined together by a covenant or *uxt* but not forming a separate cœnobial monastic community[143].

joy-giving wine/ of which mourners drink and their pains are forgotten"; Murray (1975), p. 165 and n. 7. Mahé (2000), p. 17 translates "moines pénitents".

[139] ŁP', *Ep.*, p. 186, "*ի ձեռն անիմաստ և վայրապար մարդոց*"= ŁP'-T, p. 248.

[140] ŁP', *Ep.*, p. 196, "*… և գիտեն զայս բնակեալքն ընդ իս, այլ արաւելագոյն այր մի Ակիթ անուն, որ եկեալ ի տեղիդ Գարդմանայ վանաց …*" = ŁP'-T, p. 258. See below n. 142.

[141] ŁP', *Ep.*, p. 185, "*… և զսորա զգիտութիւն բանի լուեալ իմաստուն և գիտուն մարդոց ընթերցուածոց պատուիրանացն Աստուծոյ՝ գովեցին, և խնդացին նովաւ յամենայն ժամ եկեղեցիք և վկայարանք սրբոց և տեղիք վարդապետարանք.*" = ŁP-T', p. 248.

[142] ŁP, I.viii, p. 11, "…. *քաղաքն Վաղարշապատ, զբնակութիւն ոստանի Արշակունի թագաւորացն, զբարձրաբերձ շինուածս անթիւ ապարանացն, … զՀրեշտակացոյց Հիմնարկութիւնն սրբոյ տանն Աստուծոյ, մեծի եկեղեցւոյն կաթողիկէի, և զայնց վկայարանաց ճգնազգեցիկ երանելի կուսանացն* = ŁP'-T, p. 44.; III.lxxxvi, p. 157,"*(Վահան Մամիկոնեան) եկեալ Հասանէր … ի Վաղարշապատ քաղաք … կատարէր զսովորական ուխտս և զպատարագս ի սուրբ եկեղեցւոջն կաթողիկէի, զոր Հիմնարկեալ նորոգեաց մեծապայծառ շքեղութեամբ զՀնացեալ գործ նախնեացն իւրոց…: Եւ ի տեղիս վկայարանացն … զուարճանային*"= ŁP-T, p. 217. Ł P', *Ep.*, p. 186,"*զՀոյակապ և զականաւոր տեղին ի Նոր քաղաքի, որում անուն էր սուրբ Կաթողիկէ եկեղեցի, վանօքն*"= ŁP'-T, p. 248; p. 195, "*զվանս սուրբ կաթողիկէի*" = ŁP-T, p. 257. Nor could any "monastery" have been built "two hundred years ago" as Łazar claims, *Ep.*, p. 196, "*յերկերիւր ամէ շինեալ վանորայքն*" = ŁP'-T, p. 259. It interesting to note that at the end of the VIth century, the future katholikos of Kart'li, Kiwrion is called "*vanac' erē*c of the holy cathedral (*սրբոյ Կաթողիկէի վանաց երէց)*" at the time of his consecration by the katholikos Movsēs I, YK, xvi, p. 85 = YK-M, p. 93, a title curiously reminiscent of the "*vank'* of the holy cathedral" and its servants mentioned by Łazar P'arpec'i. In Kiwrion's case, Maksoudian translates the term as, "elder of the rectory". In the VIIth century, Ps. Sebēos also refers to a certain Yovanik as the "*vanac' erēc'* of the holy cathedral [*վանաց երէց զսրբոյն կաթողիկէին*]". Ps.S, xxxviii, p. 79 = S-T, p. 120.

[143] Cf. here the commentary of Mahé (2000), p. 16 on the community surrounding St. Sahak I,"Il s'agit de congrégations liées à un sanctuaire qui lui fournit un lieu de réunion…. Astreints à participer activement aux offices et aux cérémonies religieuses, leurs membres restent toutefois majoritairement, sinon exclusivement des laïcs" and the

One more problematic example may be relevant here. Speaking of the destruction of Saint Nersēs' foundations by king Pap after the patriarch's murder, the *Epic Histories* cite the existence of *kusastan*s*:*

> The walled and fortified dwellings-for virgins in the various districts and towns … [built by the patriarch] for them, for the care over their well-kept vows … so that all those who were faithful or consecrated [*hawatacealk'*] virgins might assemble there in fasting and in prayer, and receive their food from the world and their own parents[144].

In this case definite structures seem to be indicated and the usual interpretation of this passage has been that of a reference to "convents" inhabited by "nuns"[145]. But that is not necessarily what is being said. The women described here as "consecrated virgins" assemble in these places for ascetic practices such as fasts and prayers, but they do not live there permanently, nor are they cut off from the world or their families from whom they receive their sustenance. The *kusastan*s are specifically said to have been built in towns [*awan*s] and their fortifications may well have been intended for protection rather than enclosure, since the result of their destruction by the king was to reduce the women to prostitution[146]. The model which springs to mind, therefore, is less of a monastic community than of the "daughters of the covenant" [*bnāt qyāmā*] attested by Aphraat for the Syrian world[147]. This is all the more likely given the contemporary alternate reading of the fifteenth canon of the council of Šahapivan in ms. 659, noted above[148].

In this connexion, a curious passage in the *History* of Ełišē may also be relevant. Earlier, he had noted that the Persians had ordered men and women living in their own hermitages [*menanoc'k'*], to change their garments for secular dress"[149] Now, he went on to bewail the fact that at

similarity to the one created around the Holy Sepulchre in 495. Ibid., p. 17. In, Ibid., p. 18-22, he takes the V-VIIth centuries as a period of "transition de l'érémitisme au cénobitisme" but he too is of the opinion that "La maison religieuse dirigée par Lazare, que l'on n'ose pas encore appeler tout à fait un monastère, n'a pas de règle communautaire comme dans le monachisme ultérieur" (p. 21).

144 BP, V.xxxi, p. 232, "*աւերել զկուսաստանսն ի գաւառս գաւառս և յաւանս յաւանս պարսպեալս և ամրացեալս,… որ նորին Ներսիսի էր շինեալ վասն ամրապահս առանդոցն զգուշութեան: … զի որ միանգամ կուսանք և հաւատացեալք իցեն՝ անդր ժողովեսցին ի պահս և յաղօթս, և կերակրել յաշխարհէ և յիւրաքանչիւր ընտանեաց:*" = BP-G, p. 211.

145 See BP-G, p. 540, s.n. "kusastan".

146 Idem.

147 Vööbus (1958), p. 98 sq. 197-207; Murray (1975) p. 14.

148 See above p. 195-197.

149 E, ii, p. 52, "*արք և կանայք, որ բնակեալ են ի յիւրաքանչիւր մենանոցս փոխեսցեն զհանդերձ իւրեանց ըստ աշխարհական կարգաց*" = E-T, p. 103

the time of the Sasanian occupation of Armenia, the wives of the Persian guardsmen or *p'uštipan* had the audacity to tear off the garments of the "faithful" or consecrated women [*hawatawor kananc'n*], an action which would patently have been impossible had these women lived in enclosed, isolated communities[150]. The very fact that these men and women wore identifying garments distinguishing them from the rest of the population, implies their presence in secular society and their similarity to the Syrian *bnay* and *bnāt qyāmā* who likewise wore identifying dress[151].

Whatever the actual practices of these few enigmatic examples, they seem to have constituted rare exceptions rather than the rule. The evidence of the contemporary Vth century Armenian sources concerning the overwhelming majority of the solitaries and identifying them as *mianjank*' or *vanakank',* is internally coherent and altogether devoid of any suggestion of organized stability. The "monastic" vocabulary may seem familiar but not its setting which is altogether eremitical.

From the very beginning, the characteristic pattern for holy men places them in isolation and stresses the abandonment of stable dwellings. The first model for this ascetic withdrawal from established communities is given by Saint Gregory according to Agat'angełos:

> He himself at frequent intervals went out to the deserted mountains where he made himself an example. He took various pupils from each *menastan* and went to live in the mountains in solitude; in grottoes and caverns: they made herbs their daily food. Thus they gave themselves over to mortifications, … … With the same spiritual practices he passed many days in desert places at the source of the Euphrates river, dwelling in grottoes and caverns in the ground and on the summit of mountains, taking as an example the great Elijah or the blessed baptist …[152]

until he finally withdrew to the cave of Manē, where he died according to tradition[153]. Aristakēs, his younger son and successor as patiarch,

[150] E, iii, p. 65, "*յանդգնեցան և ևս կանայք փշտիպանացն … պատառել զՀանդերձս Հաւատաւոր կանանցն*" = E-T, p. 115

[151] Vööbus (1958), I, p. 206.

[152] Aa §846, p. 380, "*Եւ ինքն ընդ ժամանակս ժամանակս յանապատ լերինս ելանէր, ուր և ինքեան իւրով անձամբն իսկ օրինակ ցուցանէր: Առեալ զոմանս ոմանս յաշակերտացն յիւրաքանչիւր մենաստանաց՝ երթեալ, լեռնակեաց, մենակեաց, սորամուտ, ծակախիթ եղեալ և զարօրեակն խոտաբուտ ճարակօք վճարեալ: Եւ այսպէս վշտակեաց տկարութեան զանձինս տուեալ, …*" = .Aa-T, p. 381. Aa. §848, p. 382, "*Եւ նովին Հոգեկրօն արուեստիւն Հանեալ աւուրս բազումս յանապատ տեղիս, յակունս Եփրատական գետոյն, յայրս և ի քարածերպս երկրին բնակեալ լինէր, և ի կատարս լեռանց, զօրինակ առեալ մեծի մարգարէին Եղիայի, և կամ զերանեալ զմկրտչին …*" = Aa-T, p. 383; cf. §839, p. 392-393.

[153] Aa §861-862, p. 396 = p. 397. However, Thomson Aa, p. xxxiii notes that this portrait of Gregory is modeled on Koriwn's portrait of Maštoc' for which see below p. 212 and n. 159. Gregory's last years and death, omitted in Aa, are detailed in Vk, p. 275-300.

followed his father's example, "dwelling in the desert in his own hermitage[154].

The saintly Daniēl of Tarōn, who was deemed worthy of the patriarchal throne in the absence of a Gregorid candidate, normally lived:

> in uninhabited mountains … He [had] only a single garment of skins and wore sandals; his food was the root of plants ….And when he came down from the desert to inhabited places to do the work of God, … he often [came] to … an exiguous little valley in a small wood of ash trees …. And on this spot was the place of St. Daniēl's cell, the cave that he had made his dwelling, and from this spot he carried out the purpose of his visitation[155].

Daniēl's Greek disciple Epiphanius/Epip'an lived atop a mountain called: "The Throne of Anahit"

> He had been nurtured from childhood in the desert". And after the death of the great high-priest Nersēs, he went and dwelt in the desert of Great Cop'k' at a place called Mambrē on the river named Mamušeł. And he dwelt in rocky caves, and he was constantly with the wild beasts of the desert, and bears and pards gathered to him. And he was constantly in the desert …[156]

His Syrian colleague Šałita, was also

> a religious desert dweller living-in-the-mountains [*krōnawor anapatawor*]. … He lived on the mountain *Aṙewc* [Lion] … … From his childhood, he had been entirely nurtured in the desert and had eaten grass with the anchorites-in-the-desert [*anapataworkʻ*]. And after the death of Saint Nersēs he went … and dwelt among lions,,, and wild beasts were the companions of his life through all the days of his life as he wandered in the desert[157].

[154] Aa §861, p. 394 "… *զսուրբ Արիստակէս բնակեալ յանապատի, յուրում մենաւորաստանին.*" = p. 395.;

[155] BP, III.xiv, p. 48-49, "*Եւ բնակութիւն իւրոց կայենիցն յանմարդի լերինս, …: Միահանդերձ մաշկանափորտն սանդաղաւոր, և կերակուր իւր արմատք բանջարոց … յորժամ յանապատաց ի շէնս իջանէր վասն գործոյ Աստուծոյ … ի դոյզն ձորձորակին ի սակաւ անտառակին ի Հացուտ պուրակին …: Յայնմ տեղոջ էր սորա կայեանք խցկան սրբոյն Դանիէլի. էր դարափոր արարեալ բնակութիւն. և յայնմ տեղոջ զդիտաւորութիւն այցելութեանն՝ կատարէր:*" = BP-G, p. 87.

[156] BP, V.xxvii, p. 225, "… *սա ի մանկութենէ սնեալ էր յանապատի: Եւ յետ մահուանն մեծի քահանայապետին Ներսիսի եկն բնակեցաւ նա ի մեծ Ծոփս յանապատին, որ կոչի անուն տեղւոյն Մամբրէ, ի վերայ գետոյն՝ որ անուանեալ կոչի Մամուշեղ: Եւ էր բնակեալ ի քարանձաւս, և հանապազորդեալ էր ընդ գազանս անապատի, և ժողովեցին առ նա արջք և ինձք:*" = BP-G, p. 206.

[157] BP, V.xxv-xxvi, p. 223-224, "*Արք երկու կրօնաւորք անապատաւորք մինչ դեռ նստէին ի լերինն, անուն միում Շաղիտա … և նստէր յԱռեւծ լերինն: … … և ի տղայութենէ իւրմէ սնեալ էր համակ յանապատս, և ընդ անապատաւորս խոտաճարակ լեալ էր: Եւ յետ հանգստեան սրբոյն Ներսիսի գնաց չոգաւ … և բնակէր ի մէջ առիւծուց … Եւ գազանք էին կենաց կցորդ նորա, մինչ շրջէր նա յանապատս զամենայն աւուրս կենաց իւրոց:*" = BP-G, p. 205-206.

At a later date, the brother of a bishop named P‘awstos was said to have been:

> A wonderous mountain dweller [*leaṙnakan*] of the religious solitary-desert-anchorites [*krōnazgeac‘ mēnakeac‘ anapatakeac‘ leaṙnakan*] … He wandered in the desert and the mountains dressed in skins and eating grass until the day of his [eternal] rest[158].

Early in his career, Saint Maštoc‘, after having worked in the royal chancellery:

> joined the crusading legion of Christ, and soon entered the monastic order [*miaynakec‘akan karg*]. He experienced many kinds of hardships, … He subjected himself to all types of spiritual discipline — solitude, mountain dwelling, hunger, thirst and living on herbs, in dark cells, clad in sackcloth with the floor as his bed[159].

An almost identical, even if more elaborate, account is given in the *History* of Łazar P‘arpec‘i, who substitutes *karg vanakanut‘ean* for Koriwn's *miaynakec‘akan gund,* thereby demonstrating the synonymous character of this vocabulary and of its content:

> He became desirous of the monastic order [*karg vanakanut‘ean*]. He went to the monastery [*vank‘*] of a large group of brothers [*elbarc‘*] and receiving the monastic habit [*zkerparans vanakanut‘ean*] became outstanding and renowned in every way. He abstained from all worldly cares and earthly preoccupations …; turning to the eremitic life [*anapatakan krōn*] … He lived in the desert in various caves and a severely ascetic way of life, with many other holy men of religion [*kronawor*] and prayer-loving brothers …[160]

Łazar P‘arpec‘i speaks admiringly of the noble lord Ałan Arcruni who lived in deserts with select men '"in rigorous asceticism" [*i čgnut‘iwns*

158 BP, VI.vi, p. 268-269, "*Եւ էր եղբայր մի Փաւստեայ եպիսկոպոսի, կրօնազգեաց մէնակեաց անապատակեաց լեառնական սքանչելի: … շրջէր սա յանապատս մաշկաՀանդերձ ճարակաւոր ի լերինն մինչև յօր Հանգստեան իւրոյ:*" = BP-G, p. 235.

159 K, iv, p. 38, "*Եւ Հաճեալ Հրամանացն՝ ի խաչակիր գունդն Քրիստոսի խառնէր, և անդէն վաղվաղակի ի միայնակեցական կարգ մտանէր: Բազում և ազգի ազգի վշտակեցութիւն … կրէր… ամենայն կրթութեամբ Հոգևորացն զանձն տուեալ՝ միայնաւորութեան, լեռնակեցութեան, քաղցի և ծարաւոյ և բանջարաճաշակութեանց, արգելանաց անլուսից, խարազնազգեստ և գետնատարած անկողնոց:*" = K-N, p. 27.

160 ŁP‘, I.x, p. 13 "*…. յետ այնորիկ տենչացեալ կարգի վանականութեան՝ երթայ ի վանս բազմութեան եղբարց, և ընկալեալ զկերպարանս վանականութեան՝ լինէր ընտիր յամենայնի և երևելի. Հրաժարէր յամենայն աշխարՀազբօս երկրաւոր զբաղմանց. Ապա յանապատական կրօնս փոխեալ՝ … և կայր յանապատս ի բազում տեղիս քարանձաւաց, մեծաւ առաքինութեամբ և խստամբէր վարիւք, բազում և այլ սուրբ վարուք կրօնաւորօք և աղօթասէր եղբարք*" = ŁP‘-T, p. 47.

mecamecs].[161] And he relates his own experience in his *Letter to Vahan Mamikonean*:

> Going to Siwnik‘, I lived there two years, spending the winters in a cave, with a man named Moses, famous … for his piety. But the site was cramped. In the summer, because of the terrible heat of the place …[162]

The pattern of life depicted remains immutable and in no way compatible with any form of cœnobial system.

To be sure, Saint Daniēl's disciples are said to have filled the regions to which they were sent with *vank*‘s, but the detailed description of the community surrounding another of their colleagues, Gind of Tarōn, once again leaves little doubt as to the clearly impermanent character of these foundations:

> [Gind] was the head of the religious/mourners [*abełayic‘*] and the spiritual-teacher of hermits [*vardapet mianjanc‘*], the spiritual leader of solitaries [*ar̄aǰnord menakec‘ac‘*], the overseer of solitary-communities [*verakac‘u vanerayc‘*], the teacher of all anchorites-living-in-the-desert [*usuc‘ič‘ anapataworac‘*], and the supervisor of all those who had renounced the world for the love of God. They lived in the desert, in inaccessible rock-hewn caverns, or in caves in the ground; having but one garment [and] going barefoot, they were abstemious, eating herbs, vegetables and roots. They wandered about like wild beasts in the mountains, covered with skins, hides and goatskins, bearing want, suffering, and anguish, straying in the desert in cold and in heat, in hunger and in thirst for the love of God … Like flocks of birds they dwelt in the clefts of the rock, in stone caves, with nothing, possessing nothing, sparing themselves nothing, and giving no care to their bodies …and they wandered in many heathen places … and turned back many strayers… And St Gind filled all the deserts with solitaries [*menakk‘*] and all the inhabited places with communities [*vank‘*] and in the world he corrected and set down many regulations for mankind … But for his own lot [Gind] took as a dwelling place the desert from which spring the sources of the Ep‘rat river. He lived in a cleft of the rocks where the earlier dwelling of the first Grigor had been … and then great *anapatawor* Gind dwelt in the same cleft. … And St Trdat lived in the district of Tarōn where he had built his brotherhood [*ełbarc‘*][163].

[161] ŁP, I.iv, p. 5"*կեցեալ յանապատս ընդ արս ընտիրս ի ճգնութիւնս մեծամեծս*" = ŁP‘-T, p. 38,

[162] ŁP‘, *Ep*. p. 187, "*Եւ երթեալ ի Սիւնիս՝ կեցի անդ ամս երկուս, ձմեռն ի քարայրի, առ առն միում հռչակելոյ …յամենայն կրօնաւորութիւնս, որում անուն էր Մովսէս, և տեղին անձուկ. և զամառն, յաղագս տօթոյ տեղւոյն, …*" = ŁP‘-T, p. 250.

[163] BP, VI,xvi, p. 274-276, "[Gind] *էր գլուխ աբեղայից, և վարտապետ միանձանց, և առաջնորդ մենակեցաց, և վերակացու վաներայից, և ուսուցիչ ամենայն անապատաւորաց, և տեսուչ ամենեցուն՝ որք միանգամ վասն սիրոյն Աստուծոյ յաշխարհէ էին մեկնեալ, ի յանապատս բնակեալ, ի քարանձաւս ամրացեալք յայրս և ի քարածերպս երկրի, և միա-հանդերձք բոկագնացք զգաստացեալք խոտաճարակք ընդաբուտք արմատակերք, զօրէն*

The numerous foundations of the peripatetic Maštoc‘ appear to have been of similar type:

> he established many and countless groups of monks [*vanakanac‘*] in inhabited as well as in uninhabited places, countless groups in lowlands, in mountains, in caves and enclosed places. From time to time he showed himself as an example to them. From all the hermitages [*menastank‘*] he took with him a few pupils to retire to the mountains and live in caves. They secluded themselves in caverns and ended the day by receiving their daily nourishment from herbs[164].

Obviously, none of these communities were in any sense permanent. No specific buildings are mentioned as against mountain tops and caves. There is no reference to a uniform rule uniting and governing these communities[165]. They evidently could be entered and left at will, as Łazar P‘arpec‘i was to do after his two year's sojourn in Siwnik‘[166]. So deeply

գագանաց ի լերինս շրջէին՝ լեշկամաշկօք և մորթօք այծենեօք, նեղեալք տառապեալք և տարակուսեալք, յանապատի մոլորեալք, ի ցուրտ ի տօթ, ի քաղց և ի ծարաւ վասն սիրոյն Աստուծոյ: … զօրէնս երամոյ թռչնոց բնակեալ էին սոքա ի ծագս վիմաց, ի սորս քարանձաւաց, անինչք անստացուածք անխնամք, առանց դարմանոց ամենևին չտանել մարմնոց: … Եւ ընդ բազում Հեթանոսն տեղիս շրջէին … դարձուցանէին զմոլորութիւն բազմաց… Եւ սուրբն Գինդ լնոյր զամենայն անապատս մենակեցօք, և զամենայն շէնս վաներաւ, և բազում յաշխարհի ուղղեալ կացուցանէր կարգս մարդկան…: Բայց սակայն ինքն առեալ վիճակ բնակութեան ունէր զանապատն, ուստի բխեալ Հոսեն ակունք Եփրատ գետոյն: Անդէն բնակեալ ընդ ծագս վիմացն, ուր յառաջու կայեանքն էին մեծին Գրիգորի առաջնոյ … ի նոյն ծագս էր բնակեալ մեծն անապատաւորաց Գինդ:… Եւ սրբոյն Տրդատայ կայեանք բնակութեան էր ի գաւառն Տարօնոյ, չինեալ զիւր եղբարց:" = BP-G, p. 239-240. See also BP, V.xxvii, p. 226 = BP-G, p. 207 and below p. 215-216 for Epip‘an's foundation at Mambrē.

For the startling similarity of these practices to those described in works attributed to Ephraem Syrus and other early Syriac writers, see Mathews (2005), p. 151-168.

164 K, xxii, p. 80, "*Եւ դարձեալ բացում և անՀամար գունդս վանականաց ի շէնս և յանշէնս, դաշտականս և լեռնականս, անձաւամուտս և արգելականս բնակեցուցեալ Հաստատէր: Զորս ընդ ժամանակս ժամանակս իւրով խսկ անձամբն օրինակ ցուցանէր. առեալ զոմանս յաշակերտաց յիւրաքանչիւր մենաստանացն և երթեալ լեռնակեաց, սորամուտ ծակախիթ եղեալ:*" = K-N, p. 45. Norehad gives "cloisters" for *argelakank‘*, *loc.cit.*, but this is a clear anachronism.

165 The rules given by Gind were "for mankind" in general and not specifically for his community, see above p. 213, as were the "righteous regulations" left "in these districts" by his colleague Epip‘an on his departure. There is no trace of the elaborate pattern of the Basilian *Rules*, which are not attested as being in use in Armenia until centuries later, See above p. 183 and n. 22.

166 See above p. 213. It is worth noting here that canon xxxiv in the VIth century collection attributed to Nersēs and Meršapuh specifies that, "covenanters (*uxtawork‘*) who dwell in the desert *(anapat)* must return home before sundown and go out at sunrise" and that, "solitaries (*monazunk‘*) and the children/inmates of a *vank‘(vanac‘ mankunk‘*) dare not stay anywhere but in a *vank‘*, or if there be no *vank‘*, they should go to the house of the senior priest (*awag erēc‘*)", making it evident that even then the solitaries entered and left their dwellings at will and were in no sense cloistered. KH, I, p. 489-490 (= M, canons 33-34, p. 276).

rooted was this type of eremitic community, that it survived even in much later times. Thus, early in the Xth century, more than a generation after Mariam Bagratuni's great monastic foundations at Sewan, the katholikos John the Historian found on Mount Sepuh, a community identical with those familiar to Vth century sources:

> in the glens and the fastness of the caves … people [were] living, celibates as well as hermits, who wore the cilice and lay on the ground. They wore no shoes and were poorly fed; as disciples of righteousness and descendants of virtue they spent their time in continuous prayer, and supplicatory implorations. The latter did not live together in one place, but were scattered along the foot of the mountain, where their living quarters are to be found. Everyone provided for his own physical necessities by toilsome sweat[167].

As against the stability which would characterize cœnobial foundations, the ascetics described in the early texts were dedicated not only to an eremitic life, but to one of almost constant movement. Saint Daniēl's journeys were miraculously assisted:

> He walked with his shoes over the water of rivers and neither wetted them nor took them off. And in wintertime, when a great thickness of snow was piled on the wintry mountains, and he wished to cross somewhere over such mountains at such a time because of the needs of a journey somewhere, the snow suddenly became black earth before him. And if he wished to go to some distant place, he sped effortlessly on like lightening as though he were flying, and immediately found himself where he wished to be[168].

His disciple Šałita seems to have had the same gift for walking dryshod over water as he wandered in the desert[169]. Less miraculously, Daniēl's other disciples ranged far and wide over the neighbouring lands. Epip'an may have settled "numerous solitary brothers [*ełbark' miabans*] of one

[167] YK, lv, p. 359 "*Տեսի անդ ի ծործորս և յամուրս քարանձաւաց բնակեալ՝ արս կուսակրօնս, խարազնազգեացս, գետնախշտիս, բոկագնացս, խոշորաճաշակս. մշտամռունչ յաղօթս և յաղերսալի պաղատանս, աշակերտք արդար վաստակոց, և ծնունդք առաքինութեան: Եւ սոքա ոչ թերեւս միախուռն ի միասին բնակեալք, այլ ցան և ցիր առ ստորոտով լերինն կալեալ կայանս, որք և բազմաշխատ քրտամբք երկոց իւրաքանչիւրօք զՀարկաւոր պէտս մարմնոց վճարէին:*" = YK-M, p. 199. Further study of the interim period of the VIIIth and most of the IXth centuries obviously remains a *sine qua non*.

[168] BP, III.xiv, p. 48, "*Սա և կօշկօք քայլելոյն գնայր ի վերայ ջուրց գետոց, և ոչ թանային. և ոչ Հանէր սա: Եւ յաւուրս ձմերայնոյն՝ յորժամ կուտեալ դիզեալ զմեծութիւն բազմութիւն թանձրութեան ձեանցն կուտակեալ Հիւսեալ ձեանցն ի վերայ ձմերային լերանցն՝ յայնպիսի լերանց ի վերայ ընդ այնպիսի ժամանակի կամէր ուրեք երթալ ի պէտս ճանապարՀի, յանկածօրէն ձիւնն ցամաք արջն լինէր առաջի նորա: Եւ զի կամէր ի Հեռաստան ուրեք երթալ, իբրև զփայլակն սլացեալ լինէր անաշխատ. իբրև թռուցեալ յոր կամէրն երթալ ի տեղին, յանկարծօրէն անդ գտանէր:*" = BP-G, p. 87.

[169] BP, V.xxvik, p. 224= BP-G, p. 206.

mind and one faith mountain-dwellers, ascetics and hermits [*leaṙnakank‘, čgnawork‘ mianjunk‘*] at his hermitage of Mambrē, and set an elder or priest [*erēc*] as their head, but leaving them behind,"he went forth to the land of the Greeks taking with him some five hundred disciples who were *mianjunk‘, leaṙnakank‘* and *anapatakank‘*[170]. Maštoc‘ himself traveled almost constantly, taking his disciples on his various journeys throughout Caucasia and sending them abroad from Edessa in Mesopotamia to Constantinople[171].

Without extending the list of these examples any further, the overwhelming majority of the groups depicted in the contemporary Vth century Armenian sources demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt that the vocabulary they use may not be interpreted in the sense of stable cœnobial communities, Basilian or other. At most, in a few cases an argument may perhaps be made for the presence of agglomerations of the *laura* type supervised by an elder or *protos*, but in which each participant lived separately in a cave or cell and met only on certain occasions to celebrate the liturgy[172]. The references to "concecrated virgins" or "children of the covenant" and the common use of the word *uxt,* in its sense of "pact, covenant" and not merely "oath", seem to suggest a link to Syrian models and institutions such as the "sons and daughters of the covenant [*bnay or bnāt qyāmā*]"[173]. Similar parallel cases are provided by the Syrian "traveling monks" and anchorites living together in groups noted by Vööbus[174]. Such models are especially likely in the light of our

[170] BP, V.xxvii-xxviii, p. 226-227 = BP-G, p. 207. For Cyril of Skythopolis' account of disciples around an ascetic master such as saint Euthymios in Palestine, see below n. 206; also Canivet (1977), p. 49-50, 212, who notes that such gatherings did not imply a monastic foundation; see also then next note.

[171] K *passim.* Guillaumont (1979), p. 224 also notes that "le prototype du moine est le patriarche Abraham, à qui Dieu a dit: 'Quitte ton pays, ta famille, la maison de ton père et va vers le pays que je te montrerai. … le moine devient un pélerin, un perpétuel voyageur: et ainsi est né le monachisme errant, qui s'est beaucoup développé en Syrie."

[172] See for instance BP, V.xxviii, p. 228-230 = BP-G, p. 208-209, for the case of the "austere brother" who attended the liturgy performed by priest at the martyrium, but after his miraculous vision, dug himself a pit where he remained for the rest of his life. Canivet (1977), p. 212-213, also observed in the case of Syrian monasticism that an agglomeration of individual cells surrounded by a "mur de clôture" began to appear in the IVth century, but that despite the gradual addition of various buildings such as churches, workshops meeting rooms, refectories, or guest houses, "rien ne nous prouve qu'il y ait eu un dortoir pour la communauté. See below nn. 184-185, for the growth of Palestinian foundations.

[173] See e.g. Aphraat, *Dem.* vi, also above p. 196-197. and n. 85-86.

[174] Vööbus (1958), I, p. 222-223; Ibid., (1959) for the testimony of Ephraem; see also Pena *et al.* (1980 and Canivet (1977), p. 210 on the gradual settling of the "anachorètes qui mènent une vie errante, sans feu ni lieu, …[mais] …tôt ou tard ils se fixent

increasing awareness of the influence of Aphraat and Ephraem on early Armenian Christianity[175]. In any case, the critical mass of the contemporary narratives points to the conclusion that during the IVth,Vth and probably the major part of the VIth centuries Armenian ascetic life with the possible exception occasional impermanent ascetic groups held together by a common covenant or purpose, such as the service of a particular shrine or church, displayed primarily an eremetic and peripatetic model, rather than one of regularly settled and permanent monastic communities.

We have already had the occasion to see that this conclusion is corroborated by the remaining material already considered. Such archæological evidence as we can presently rely on suggests the VIIth or at the earliest the latter part of the VIth century as the *terminus post quem* for the construction of monastic complexes as against single church buildings on the Armenian plateau. Similarly, the canons take us no further back than the same period, or at any rate to the mid VIth century at the earliest, if we accept the canons attributed to the katholikos Nersēs II and his co-president at the Second Council of Duin of 555, the Mamikonean bishop Meršapuh of Tarōn, with the sole exception of the earlier stratum of the xvth and xvith canons of the Council of Šahapivan, which reflects the same Syriac correspondences, as are found in the early narrative sources.

Taken in conjunction with the gradual appearance of the title *vanic‘ erēc‘*, the titulature occurring in the lists of participants at the Armenian councils of the period also provides an indirect index for the eventual appearance of monastic foundations. Even though Łazat P‘arpec‘i asserted at an unexpectedly early date that not only bishops and honourable priests [*eric‘ank‘*] but "senior" [*awag*] *vanakank‘* had met together to draft an answer to the Persian letter urging the return of Armenia to the Zoroastrian faith in the middle of the Vth century[176], It is most unlikely that the term *vanakan* had already acquired here the sense of "monk",

dans des grottes naturelles, … ils plantent leur tente, fichent leurs cabanes en terre ou bâtissent une maison…".

175 Vööbus (1958), I, p. vi sq. Baker (1968), p. 346-348, on the absence of "monasticism" in early Syriac texts. As Vööbus rightly notes Syriac influence was strongest in the Armenian southern district of Tarōn whence came Daniēl and his disciple Gind as well as Maštoc‘ himself. See K, iii, p. 36, as well as Garsoïan (1992), p. 61-63, etc.

176 ŁP, II.xxiii, p. 44-45,"*սուրբ եպիսկոպոսք … և պատուական երիցունք և վանականք* … cf. *բարեպաշտ եպիկոպոսօք և աւագ քահանայիւք և վանականօք*" = ŁP‘-T, p. 81-82. The term *awag* "senior, elder, superior" does not have the connotation of a particular title and Łazar uses it indifferently for secular figures such as the "heads of clans"or *tanutēr* and the other "members" *sepuh* as well as for "priests" *k‘ahanayk‘*. Ibid., p. 45 = 82.

especially since one of the participants on this occasion was the "wonderful and angelic lord Ałan", whose eremitic practices have already been noted[177]. Elsewhere, Łazar speaks only of the "holy bishops with the honourable priests and the clergy [*uxt*][178]. Ełišē mentions in one case the inclusion of" Christian monks [*miaynakeac'*] living in monasteries [*vanorays*] into the census taken by the Persians[179], but on the same occasion as the one described by Łazar he mentions only of:

> The bishops and many chorepiskopi and honourable priests, and the holy clergy [*surb uxt*] of the church … in concert with the greatest princes and all the people of the land[180].

The ambiguous terminology of these minimal references does not provide by itself a sufficient basis for the hypothesis that a new monastic as against an eremitic order had already made its appearance. It is rather the growing use of the title of *vanic' erēc'*, especially if it is to be taken in the sense of *protos* rather than "abbot", which may provide us with a guideline leading once again to the period between the second half of the VIth and the first decade of the VIIth. century as the one inaugurating a transformation in Armenian ascetic life. Finally, this also appears to be the period in which the terms *erēc'* and *k'ahanay*, used interchangeably for a priest in Vth century sources, begin to be differentiated with the latter being reserved for the secular and presumably married clergy. Consequently, it may also mark a watershed in the separation of the black and white clergies[181].

If we now turn to the setting which may have had a bearing on the appearance of innovative institutions at the turn of the VIth to the VIIth century, the mode and attendant circumstances of the new forms still present considerable problems. In addition to the possibility of internal motivation spurred by the growing influence of Julianism in Armenia

[177] See above n. 161.

[178] ŁP', II.xxix, p. 56, "*Սուրբ եպիսկոպոսք, պատուական քահանայիւք և եկեղեցական ուխտիւ*" = ŁP'-T, p. 96.

[179] E, p. 22, "*միայնակեաց քրիստոնեայք որ բնակեալ էին ի վանորայս,*" = E-T, p. 76. Thomson, translates "monks" and "monasteries" here, but he noted the inconsistencies of these terms elsewhere in the text. Ibid.n. 12.

[180] E, p. 28,"*եպիսկոպոսք և բազում քորեպիսկոպոսք և պատուական երիցունք ի տեղեաց տեղեաց Հանդերձ սուրբ ուխտիւ եեկեղեցւոյ*" = E-T, p. 82

[181] See above p. 201-203 and nn. 110-119 for the gradual apparance of the title *vanic' erēc'* and n. 105 for the differentiation of the married priests and the *vanakan* in the *Canons* attributed to Saint Sahak. In the same period, Ps. Sebēos, xxiv, p. 44 = S-T, p. 97 interestingly notes that in Kodrik, "a certain presbyter [*erēc'*], who was named Abēl, was appointed to priestly rank [*karg k'ahanayut'ean*] in that land [*և Հաստատէին ի կարգ քահանութեան աշխարհի անդ երէց ոմն ի նոցանէ, որ անուն կոչէր Աբէլ*"

during the VI-VIIth centuries[182], two further factors need to be considered. First is the possibility, that the example of Abdišoy and his colleagues influenced the onset of a transformation in Armenian monasticism around the middle of the VIth century. It has already been said that Abdišoy, though a Syrian, played an important rôle in the affairs of contemporary Armenia and was present at the second Council of Duin, where he is listed alongside the Armenian bishops as a signer of the all important covenant[183]. We are told by the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* that he was an old friend of the co-president of the council, bishop Meršapuh, whose southern diocese of Tarōn was adjacent to the region of Abdišo's foundation of Sarebay just over the border[184]. This foundation seems to have been sizeable since in addition to Abdišoy, whom it identifies as a priest, the *Letter of the Orthodox Syrians* further mentions Daniēl, Yakob, Ełia and Yovsēp‘ among its priest and *vanic‘ erēc‘*s, whereas only one name is associated with the other sites named, and this title first appears in connexion with them[185] However, another possible source of influence also comes to mind.

[182] In this connexion, not only the rôle of Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i, in the VIIth century, with his interpolation of canonical sources and especially what Mardirossian (2004) p. 289-441 esps. 355-399 has called his "‘monachisation" de l'Eglise", but that of extreme Monophysitism, or more particularly Julianism, on Armenia during the VIth and VIIth centuries. would benefit from further investigation. The works of both Timothy Ælurus and Philoxenos of Mabbug were said to have been translated into Armenian for or around the time of the second Council of Duin of 555, at a time when Armenia officially adopted the Monophhysite addition to the Trisagion (see above n. 28 and Garsoïan (1999), p. 144, 198-199, 204, 212-215. See also in this connexion my forthcoming article"Le vin pur du calice dans l'Eglise arménienne"in *Etudes augustiniennes*. It is my intention to pursue this aspect in a further study on Armenia during the"interregnum"of the VI-IXth centuries.

[183] GT‘, p. 201; Garsoïan (1999), p. 478.

[184] *Narratio* §60-62, p. 34,§60 … [the Julianist] προσετέθησαναν τοῖς τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἐπισκὀποις. 61 Διὰ τοῦτο προσφιλεῖς ἐγένοντο τῷ Νερσαπὼ ἐπισκόπῳ Ταρών, … 62 διετέλεσεν ἔτη πολλὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ Ἀπτισὼ τοῦ σύρου ὃς ἀπὸ τῆς Σαρεπὰ μονῆς ἦν τῆς πλήσίον Σασῶν", cf. p. 142-150, Garitte's commentary and the localization of Sarebay/Sarbat. *Cœnobia* had of course been known in Syria at an earlier date, see Vööbus (1958), p. 138 sq., Pena *et al*. (1983), p. 19-26, Escolan (1999) p. 11 dates"L'apparition du mouvement monastique en Syrie"as against the period of 'protomonachisme' from 360 to 400, but their golden age was in the VIth century, Ibid., p. 29-33. Cf. Flusin (1983), p. 116-118; Id. (1992), II, p. 15-46, esp. 34-3. See also the next note.

[185] GT‘, p. 172, 174 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 457, 459. The contact of southern Armenia with the Syro-Mesopotamian world went back to the very origins of the country's Christianity, see Garsoïan (1992), p. 61-62, and *cœnobia* had begun appearing in Syria from the IVth century, Pena *et al*. (1983), p. 19, "La naissance du cénobitisme se situe en Syrie dans la première moitié du IVe siècle; il se développe pendant le Ve siècle pour arriver à sa pleine maturité au siècle suivant Canivet (1977), p. 230,"Les monastères syriens sont bien organisés au Ve s. et les services y sont nombreux.) On the growth of Syrian monasticism, see also, *inter alios* Honigman (1952), Pena *et al* (1980), Bell-Mango (1982).

For Christianity in general, Jerusalem was obviousy the holy city par excellence. Its spiritual precedence was recognized as early as the seventh canon of the council of Nicaea, although its status as a patriarchate would be delayed by the relatively minor urban status of the city recreated after Titus' unforgettable sack[186]. As Flusin observes perceptively, for an early VIth century author such as Cyril of Skythopolis,

> "Jérusalem et la Palestine forment un espace sacré dans un monde profane, ils font figure d'un gigantesque reliquaire rayonnant de sainteté …Jérusalem l'emporte sur le reste du monde. …tout se passe comme si l'itinéraire du saint commençait à Jérusalem …Jérusalem est le terme du pèlerinage parce qu'elle est la Ville sainte;…"[187]

Armenia was no exception to this powerful early tradition centered on Jerusalem and on the pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The belief that the doctrine of Saint Gregory originated in Jerusalem, though obviously apocryphal, was already deeply rooted in Armenia by the beginning of the VIIth century as is evidenced by the acrimonious correspondence between the katholikoi of Armenia and Iberia Abraham I and Kiwrion, preserved in the *Book of Letters*[188]. The presence of Armenian pilgrims in the Holy Land is attested by numerous graffiti[189] and specifically by the reference to a particularly large group of some four hundred in Cyril's *Life of Euthymios*[190]. The early presence of Armenians in the Holy City is likewise attested by the well known mosaics with Armenian inscriptions found there as well as by the translation, probably in the Vth century, of

Palmer (1990), the preceding note and below n. 213. The importrance of Abdišo's activity, stressed by the *Narratio* seems to have been particularly significant in Armenia in the realm of doctrine as well.

[186] *Acta*,, canon vii, p. 42, "Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκπάτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαῖα, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἄξιώματος."., although the rights of Caesarea, the metropolis, were preserved.and Jerusalem's status as a patriarchate would not become official until much later.

[187] Flusin (1983), p. 116-117. As observed by Martin-Hisard (1998), p. 1219 the same focus on Jerusalem is found in contemporary Iberia, "Pour la piété géorgienne de cette période. Jérusalem occupe une place centrale. C'est sans doute un caractère que d'autres chrétientés partagent, mais il est particulièrement accentué dans la chrétienté ibère".

[188] Garsoïan (1999), p. 322 n. 101 cf. 555, n. 149"for the correction of this passage, cf. GT', p. 333-334, 337, 344.347 = Garsoïan (1999), p. 560-561, 563-564, 569-570, 571-572. This was also observed by Thomson (1985), p. 83-84. The same claim was made by Iberia, as is noted by Martin-Hisard (1998), p. 1219.

[189] Stone (1982); cf Thomson (1967).

[190] CS, 27:8-11, "συνέβη πλῆθος Ἀρμενιῷν ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην κατερχομένων ἐκκλῖναι ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ δεξιὰ καὶ παραγενέσθαι εἰς τὴν λαύραν" = CS-P, p. 22. Cf. Garsoïan (2002), p. 267 and n. 47.

the *Jerusalem Lectionary* which was adopted by the Armenian Church[191]. The presence of Armenians in the Great Laura of Saint Sabas in the Palestinian desert has been noted earlier[192], and Anastas *vardapet* asserts in his *List of Armenian Monasteries in Jerusalem* presumably dating from the early VIIth or the end of the VIth century, that he also knew of eleven Armenian monasteries in Egypt and Palestine some of which he had personally visited[193]. Once again it is with Anastas' *List* that we find ourselves on relatively safe ground in speaking of truly monastic foundations.

Anastas' reputation has not always been of the best. In the opinion of Avedis Sanjian who published and translated it, his *List* was probably unreliable though it rested on a core of truth[194]. Other critics have been still harsher[195]. A number of their objections are well founded. Anastas' claim that there were in Jerusalem itself some seventy Armenian and Albanian monasteries of which he gives the list is obvious fantasy. He repeats for the Armenian monasteries in Jerusalem the standard tradition attached to many native foundations, namely that they had been built by Saint Gregory the Illuminator himself, or at least by his descendant Saint Nersēs[196]. Nevertheless, as I have argued elsewhere, his knowledge of early Armenian history and prosopography is reasonably accurate where it can be controlled[197]. The citation of a fragment of his work in the *History of the Caucasian Albanians,* well before the earliest known manuscript of the *List,* makes a late forgery unlikely. Anastas' complaints of the persecutions endured by the Armenians in Jerusalem coincide with the period of Chalcedonian predominance following the earlier monophysite influence in Palestine

[191] On Armenians in Jerusalem and "The influence of Jerusalem back on Armenia", see also Thomson (1985). On the mosaics, see Der Nersessian (1977), p. 68-71, pls. 44-45; Aṙak'elian (1978), p1-9; Evans (1982), 217-221, pls.1-3. On the lectionary, Renoux (1993), p. 132. Cf. Garsoïan (2002), p. 259.

[192] See above p. 185 and n. 28 and below, nn. 212-213.

[193] Sanjian (1969), p. 273 "*Արդ՝ էին յայլ տեղիս վանորայք Հայոց ի շրջակայս՝ Եգիպտոս, յԱղէքսանդրիա, ի Թէփաիդ և ի լեառն Սինէական վանորայք մետասանք. նա և ի լեառն Թաբօր, և յեզր ծովուն Տիբերիա, և յայլ սահմանս Պաղեստինոյ. զորոց զյոլովն իմով իսկ աչօք տեսեալ յամս բացումս մնալով անդ յերկրին այնմիկ.*" = p. 278. See preceding note for the Armenians present at the Great Laura, some of whom may in fact have been from Pers- rather than Roman Armenia.

[194] Sanjian (1969), p. 285-286.

[195] Garsoïan (2002), p. 260

[196] Sanjian (1969), p. 272, "*Եւ այս ամենայն վանորայքս Երուսաղէմ ի Սուրբ Լուսաւորչէն Հաստատեցան. բայց յոլովս ի Ներսիսէ, զոր Հրամայեաց շինել ի պատճառս աղօթից ի փրկութիւն Հայոց:*" = p. 278. See Ibid., p. 268-272 = p. 275-277 for the list.

[197] Garsoïan (2002), p. 261-262.

and Jerusalem[198]. Most convincingly of all, Anastas' information concerning the difficult situation in which the Armenian monasteries found themselves in the late VIth century is corroborated by the *Letter to Abas of Albania* written by the Chalcedonian Patriarch John IV of Jerusalem, which must date from 574-575, the year of John's accession to the patriarchate[199]. This coincidence between two sources, deriving from diametrically opposing doctrinal points of view, no longer allows us to disregard the *List* attributed to Anastas or reject the picture he gives of Armenian monastic foundations in the Holy City around the end of the VIth century, despite some of its occasionally doubtful aspects[200]. Moreover, his assertion as to the presence of urban Armenian monasteries in Jerusalem have also been supported by recent archaeological discoveries[201],

Unfortunately for us, the description of the Armenian monasteries in Jerusalem given by Anastas is scant, but its few details are crucial for our purpose. First and foremost the foundations referred to by Anastas are indubitably stable that is to say cœnobial communities with actual buildings, which the monks abandoned in times of trouble to be ransomed back, to be given over to others, or to be demolished and remain in ruins[202]. John IV specifies that on one occasion "an Armenian monastery was burned down"[203] Furthermore,these foundations were of mixed type, since side by side with monastic buildings Anastas mentions the individual cells of anchorites [*xrčt'awor miaynakeac'k.'*[204]. No explicit

[198] CS, p. 41:24, 47:5-49:20; 127: 15-128:16 = CS-P, p. 38, 43-46, 136-137; Garsoïan (2002), p. 265, details the struggle of Saint Sabas against monophysite influence on the empress Eudoxia and his eventual victory.

[199] John IV, *Ep.* (1896). Cf. Garsoïan (1999), p. 247-248, 260-261, 284-285, 294-296, 490-501. Ead. (2002), p. 263-264.

[200] Ibid., p. 259-265.

[201] Amit and Wolff (1994), p. 293-298; Goldfus (2003, p. 75-77

[202] E.g. Sanjian (1969), p. 272,-273 "*իշխանք Հայոց միաբանեալ ետուն եօթն կենդինարս թագաւորին Յուստինիանոսի, որ է եօթանասուն հազար դահեկանս, և թափեցին յիշխանութենէ Հայրապետացն (Յունաց) զամենայն վանորայս Հայոց, եթէ արանց վանք, եթէ կանանց վանք, և եթէ խրճիթք միանձանց, անդէն զինքեանս առնելով իշխեցողս:*" = p. 278; cf. p. 273 = p. 278 for those demolished,"*բազում վանորայք (որ յԵրուսաղէմ) տապալեալ քանդեցան* " Idem for those taken over by the Greeks, "*անտերունչ մնացեալ վանս առնուին և տիրէին Յոյնք*" cf. Ibid., p. 269-272 §3, 35, 44, 55, 60-62 = p. 276-277 and for those destroyed and in ruins Ibid., p. 269 §14 "*Սիւնեաց վանք, որ յանուն Սրբոյն Գէորգայ, (զոր Տաճիկք քակեցին)* " = p. 276, cf. Ibid. p. 271 §47-48 = p. 277. This conclusion is supported by the recent discovery of an Armenian monastic complex with "a single space chapel as its prayer hall", Goldfus (2003), p. 77; Amit and Wolff (1994), p. 293-298.

[203] John IV, *Ep.* p. 252, "*Զորս ես նզովեցի և հալածեցի և քաղաքս դեռ այրէք զվանսն մի Հայոց*".

[204] Sanjian (1969), p. 274, "*Եւ միաբանեալ ամենայն հարք առաջնորդք (մենաս-*

indications are given concerning the interior organization of these communities, but the mention of superiors necessarily suggests the existence of a monastic hierarchy[205].

Though obviously meager, this description none the less coincides with the far more extensive information concerning contemporary Palestinian monasticism given by Cyril of Skythopolis and John Moschos, with is mixed pattern of eremitical caves, *laura* and *cœnobia,* with the possibility of alternation between the solitary and the communal life and the progression from the second to the first[206]. Just as in the monasteries mentioned by Anastas *vardapet*, the Palestinian communities described by Cyril of Skythopolis and Moschos are headed by superiors who are chosen or elected at the death of their predecessor[207]. Flusin has observed that Palestinian monasticism as against the Egyptian tradition responded to an aristocratric mentality[208]. The desert and urban foundations had noble ladies and the empress Eudoxia herself as patrons[209].

տանացն և խրճթաւոր միայնակեացքն), անձինք իբրև Հինգ Հարիւր, գրեցին առ երանելի կաթուղիկոսն Յովհան" = p. 279.

[205] See the preceeding note and Ibid., p. 273, "*Այլ և յոլով վանորէից մերոց առաջնորդքն մինչ վախճանէին, ոչ ոք լինէր Հոգաբարձու կարգել զայլ ոք առաջնորդ Հայոց, (յաղագս որոյ զնոյն անտերունչ մնացեալ վանսն առնուին և տիրէին Յոյնք)*" = p. 278.

[206] The pattern of the simultaneous existence in the Palestinian desert of isolated eremitical cells, the looser agglomeration of the *laura* and the evolved *cœnobion* appears throughout the work of Cyril of Skythopolis. See among others, the gathering of cells into a *laura* around the cave in which St. Euthymios had taken refuge, CS, p. 23:22-24:10, 25:13-26:18 = CS-P, p. 19-20, 21-22; the alternate residence of Saint Sabas in his isolated cave and the *laura* created for his disciples, Ibid, p. 97:23-98:20, 99:5-103:5 = CS-P. p. 106-107; 108-112; his building of the *cœnobion* of Kastellion, Ibid., p. 110:1-112:27 = CS-P, p. 119-121; the co-existence of *laura* and *cœnobion*, and the spiitual superiority of the former, since St. Sabas accepts St Euthemios' teaching that neophytes are not ready for the life in a *laura*, which would not benefit from their presence, and should first enter a monastery, CS, p. 90:26-91:29, 158:12-159 = CS-P, p. 99-100, 167-168; finally the transformation of a *laura* into a *cœnobion,* CS, p., 16:24-17:3, 62:3-66:19 = CS-P. p. 12, 59-63. The same picture is given by John Moschos *passim* one generation later. Cf. Flusin (1983), p. 30, 137-145; Id. (1992),II, p. 16-26, 31-34; Joly (1993), p. .49-64 and Canivet (1977), p. 50, for Chrysostom's description of the gathering of disciples arouind Diodorus of Tarsus, "Chrysostome …évoque les réunions des fidèles autour de lui [Diodore] sur les bords de l'Oronte … mais ne parle pas.;.. de monastères.

[207] See for example in Cyril of Skythopolis the succession of Theoktistes by Maris, then Longinos; of Saint Euthymios by Domitian followed by Elias; of Saint Sabas by Melitas and Gelasios; of Theodosios by Sophronios, CS, p. 55:13-19, 58:20-26, 189:10-15, 240:1-2 = CS-P, p. 52, 55, 198, 266. Cf. Flusin (1983), p. 137-140.

[208] Flusin (1983) p. 102, "il semble bien que nous ayons là la trace d'une mentalité aristocratique qui distingue assez nettement le monachisme palestinien du monachisme égyptien.

[209] Especially, CS, p. 53:5-12, 204:7-10 = CS-P, p. 49-50, 223 and above n. [168]; cf Flusin (1992), II, p. 29-30. "Des fondations nombreuses et importantes sont le fait, non

Similarly, nearly all the Armenian monasteries in Anastas' *List* are royal foundations or those of princely families and both he and the patriarch John IV emphasize the links between them and their noble patrons. [210] The pattern seems to be similar despite confessional divergence. Given the fact that we know from Cyril of Skythopolis that although Saint Euthemios preferred the solitude of the desert, Saint Sabas not only visited the city but

> "purchased various cells [from the monastery built near the episcopal palace] and made them into a hospice for the laura.
> To the north of the cells he purchased were other cells, which he wished to purchase on behalf of foreign monks … but had only one half solidus…. Astonished at the prompt [miraculous] assistance from God, the blessed one gave the price of the cells and founded a second hospice for the relief of monks coming from abroad. He also acquired two hospices for Castellium, one in the holy city not far from the tower of David and the other in Jericho[211].

We have no way of knowing whether any Armenians found their way to Sabas' hospices for "foreign monks", but it is evident that in addition to their presence in his desert foundations and through pilgrimages, the Armenians residing in the Holy City had ample opportunity to observe and pattern themselves on the Palestinian foundations they clearly ressembled.

de saints moines, mais de nobles et pieuses dames, qui au Ve siècle … ont orné la ville et ses alentours…"; Ibid., p. 40-41, "Nous avons dit de quelle importance furent, pour le monachisme de Jérusalem, la présence et l'action au Ve siècle de riches dévotes, au premier rang desquelles vient prendre place l'impératrice Eudocie. L'époque [suivante] que nous étudions ne connut pas de mouvements comparables. Pourtant de grandes dames viennent encore en pèlerinage. …"

[210] Nearly all of the monasteries on Anastas' *List* are princely foundations, Sanjian (1969), p. 269-272 = 276-277. Both Anastas, Ibid., p. 272 = 278 and John IV, *Ep.* p. 252, stress the concern of the Armenian princes concerning their Hierosolymitan foundations, their willingness to ransom those taken away and the claim of the Armenian princes that "Our first kings granted us these monasteries as a gift,"*Իշխանք Հայոց առ իս աղաչանս առաքեցին, եթէ առաջին թագաւորքն զվանս զայն մեզ իբրև զպարգև շնորհեցին … Որոց արարի պատասխանի, թէ անհնար է թագաւորաց հերձուածս պարգև շնորհել:*"See also above n. [171].

[211] CS, 116:10-27, "συναθροισθέτων ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Σάβας διάφορα παρ 'αὐτῶν ἀγοράσας κελλία ξενοδοχεῖον ταῦτα τῇ λαύραι πεποίηκεν. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα (κελλία) κατὰ τὸ βόρειον μέρος ἅπερ ἐβούλετο ἀγοράσαι εἰς λόγον ξένων μοναχῶν … οὐκ εἶχεν πλὴν ἑνὸς σημισσίου … ὁ δὲ μακαρίτης θαυμάσας τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ταχεῖαν ἀντίκληψιν δέδωκεν τὸ τίμημα τῶν κελλίων καὶ καθίστησιν ξενοδοχεῖον ἕτερον πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἐρχομένων ἀπὸ ξένης μοναχῶν ἀνάπαυσιν. ἦν δὲ καὶ τῶι Καστελλίωι περιποιησάμενος ξενοδοχεῖα δύο ἕν τε τῆι ἁγίαι πόλει οὐ μακρὰν τοῦ πύργου τοῦ Δαυιὶδ καὶ ἐν Ἱεριχῶ…" = CS-P, p. 125-126. Cf. Garsoïan (2002), p. 266 and n. 45. And for the importance of urban monasticism in Early Byzantine Palestine, see Goldfus (2003), p. 75-77, 79, *et passim*.

Given this similarity and the care and contact of the Armenian princes for their Hierosolymitan foundations, that we have already noted, as well as the stream of pilgrims moving back and forth from their homes to the Holy Land, it seems reasonable to ask whether we might not have here a source for a "new" type of monasticism beginning to manifest itself in Armenia at the end of the VIth century. It is worth noting that even in the Vth century, both in the case of the *Jerusalem Lectionary* that the autocephalous Armenian Church adopted as its own, and in the artistique models of the mosaics found in Jerusalem[212], the cultural current flowed from Jerusalem toward Armenia and not the reverse. Hence it seems entirely possible that this current likewise strengthened the close relations between Armenia and Palestinian monasticism whose prestige was reaching its apogee in the VIth century[213]. For the pilgrims returning home, among whom we find such a great nobleman as prince Hamazasp Kamsarakan Pahlawuni, whose ancestors claimed royal Parthian descent, at whose behest Anastas had composed his work,and who recovered and restored the Armenian monastery in the Holy City, these Armenian monasteries could provide ready models for their own subsequent foundations. [214]

The change at home was apparently slow. As the Chalcedonian Christology came to be equated with orthodoxy in Jerusalem, and for that matter on Sinai, Armenian pilgrims, viewed as heretic became less

[212] See above p. 220-221. and n. 191. Der Nersessian (1977), p. 71, "Les mosaïques de Jérusalem sont importantes non pas comme exemples d'art arménien mais en tant que témoins d'établissements religieux, et probablement aussi de la présence d'artistes arméniens dans cette ville. … C'est par leur intermédiaire que furent probablement transmis en Arménie les modèles artistiques palestiniens dont nous avons déjà constaté l'influence dans un des chapiteaux de Dvin, et dont les peintures des églises et des manuscrits offrent d'autres exemples." See also N. Thierry (1978), p. 709-722 for the subsequent influence of Palestinian iconography on Vaspurakan; and Thomson (1985), p. 83-85.

[213] See Pena *et al.* (1983), p. 19, "le VIe siècle est le siècle d'or du christianisme en Syrie, l'époque où la Syrie toute entière se confesse chrétienne". Cf. Binns (1991 p. xii, "[Cyril of Skythopolis] provides … a history of the Palestinian church during the period when it was at the height of its power and prestige"; and Flusin (1992), p. 36, "Le monachisme palestinien sert de référence: c'est dire quel est son prestige." See also above nn. 184-185.

[214] Sanjian (1969),, p. 273-274, "*Անաստաս վարդապետ Ցերապօլսեցի, ի խնդրոյ բարեպաշտ իշխանին Համազասպայ Կամսարականի Պալխաւունեաց* [sic], *գրեալ զայսոսիկ ետու նմա որ կամէր գնալ ի Սուրբ Երուսաղէմ, որ և գնաց իսկ և արժանացաւ աստուածակոխ Սուրբ Տեղեացն, … և ի Հայրապետէն Սուրբ Երուսաղէմի թափեալ ազատեաց զամենայն վանորայսն Հայոց անկելոց ընդ բռնութեամբ Յունաց*" = p. 278. The alternate reading given in p. 274 n. 53 does not alter the sense. Martin-Hisard (1993), p. 571 notes the close ties between the Georgian monasteries in Palestine and K'larǰeti whose intellectual brilliance she attributes to the influence of the intellectual activity characterizing the former in the VII century.

welcome[215]. Burdened by heavy Muslim taxes, the Armenians began to leave Jerusalem abandoning their monasteries, which would consequently decrease in importance as models[216]. In Armenia proper, as we have seen, the multiple churches which covered the plateau in the VIIth century were single buildings[217]. They were primarily linked by their scattering and mostly diminutive size to the great *naxarar* houses. This appears to have been the case both for the cathedrals built by the Mamikoneans and the Kamsarakans next to their palaces at Aruč and T'alin and, even more clearly, for the many small palatine chapels of the type dedicated to the Mother of God at T'alin by Nersēs Kamsarakan in intercession exclusively for himself, his wife and their son[218]. The troubled times of the later VIIIth and first half of the IXth century convulsed by the continuous rebellions and repressions brought on by the more intolerant religious policy of the Abbasid dynasty, were patently not propitious for the growth of monastic foundations. Earlier forms do not seem to have disappeared altogether, as we have seen in the case of the eremitic community still clustering around Mount Sepuh[219], but these seem to have been isolated exceptions to whom the future would not belong. The gradual appearance of monastic agglomerations of the the *laura* type, as against full fledged *cœnobia,* is possible though it cannot as yet be demonstrated.[220]

[215] See e.g., CS, p. 47:5-49.25 = CS-P, p. 43-46.. Also the complaints of Anastas *vardapet* concerning the mistreatment of the Armenian monks by the Greek patriarchs because of their rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, Sanjian (1969), p. 274, "*Բայց սակայն յետ ժամանակաց ինչ և աւուրց՝ սկսան բազում նեղութիւնս տալ և տանջանս Հարցն Հայոց երկաբնակ պատրիարքունք Յոհնաց սակս ոչ Հաւանելոյ նոցա ժողովոյն Քաղկեդոնի*" (= 179) and the Chalcedonian patriarch's confirmation that he had anathematized and driven the Armenians from Jerusalem, cf. John IV, *Ep.*, p. 252. "*Զորս ես նզովեցի և Հալածեցի …*".

[216] Sanjian (1969), p. 275, "*Իսկ յետոյ ի ծանրութենէ տաճկական Հարկացն նեղեալք … թողին զտեղիս իւրեանց, և Հնգետասան վանք միայն մնաց ի ձեռս Հայոց*" = p 279. Although these were located in Palestine only one, on the Mount of Olives can be considered to have been in Jerusalem.

[217] See above p. 187-188 and nn. 46, 48.

[218] Thierry (1989), p. 62-73 470, 495, 497, 500, 504, 514, 518-519, 527, 539, 555-557, 563, 565, 576, 580-581, 593-595, color pl 18, 21, 26, 29, 31, 34-37, figs. 560.627-629, 635-636, 643-644, 655, 682, 689-693, 716-717, 746-747, 780-783, 786-790, 804-806, 812, 837-839, 850-853, 883-884, 888-891. The inscription on the lintel above the doorway of the little church of the Mother of God at T'alin is still clearly legible, "*Ես Ներսէս ապոՀիպատ և պատրիկ Շիրակայ և Արշակունեաց տէր շինեցի զայս եկեղեցի յանուն աստուածածնի և բարեխաւսութեան իմոյ և Շուշանայ ամուսնոյ իմոյ և ՀրաՀատայ որդւոյ մերոյ.*"

[219] See above p. 215 n. 167 for the Xth century colony on Mt.Sepuh.

[220] See above n. 206 for the precedence of the *laura* over the *cœnobion* in Palestine.

At the present stage of our knowledge, most theses on developing changes must at best remain hypothetical and no final conclusions may be drawn. Such must await a far greater and precise knowledge of the archæological evidence than has been hitherto available; a more extensive analysis of the technical vocabulary, and further investigation of parallel Armenian and Syrian institutions for the early Christian period, as well as of the Armenian internal dogmatic and ecclesiastical evolution in the later VIth-VIIth centuries[221]. Nonetheless, the stripping away of the apocryphal Basilian tradition, the chronological conjunction of such fragmentary archæological material, as we already possess with the altered terminology, acknowledging eventually but not from the first the presence of *vanic‘ erēc‘*s, together with the elimination of the anachronisms due to lexical misconception, which have confused the remarkably clear picture of early Armenian ascetic life given by the contemporary native sources, all point already to a first break between the earlier and later forms of ascetic life. In the absence of any trace before the later VIth century, at the earliest, of the different type of monasticism which would eventually triumph from the end of the IXth century on, this later stage should not be allowed to intrude into the early Christian period in Armenia. What already seems clear at this stage of investigation is that the overwhelming bulk of the evidence, archaeological, lexical and narrative, already warrants a focus on the turning of the VIth into the VIIth century as the point which marked, not so much a period of continuing evolution or transformation in existing institutons, as the inauguration of a watershed between the earlier eremitic and largely peripatetic forms of ascetic life and the subsequent appearance of truly stable and far more elaborate foundations[222].

[221] The intermediary period, spanning the early VIIth to the late IXth centuries and preceding the brilliant monastic development under the Bagratid rulers, presents a number of problems, which I hope to address in a subsequent study.

[222] It is interesting that in Iberia, also "Des traces matérielles permettent d'affirmer l'existence de monastères au Kartli et au K‘akheti au début du VIIe siècle … ce qui tend à confirmer les traditions écrites qui placent un essor particulier du monachisme au milieu du VIe siècle." and that, as in Armenia,"l'épanouissement [des monastères] fut remarquable à partir du IXe siècle", Martin Hisard (1998), p. 1213-1214. Similarly, in Vaspurakan, Thierry (1989), p. 82 concluded that few monuments can be shown to date from the pre-Islamic period. "C'est le développement du monachisme qui suscite la plupart des fondations, mais le mouvement ne pris une grande ampleur qu'à la fin du IXe siècle." Mahé (2000), p. 14-25, tends to push the period of transition back to the Vth-VIIth century. Such a conclusion seems somewhat too early in the light of the presently available information.

Bibliography

Abbreviations:

ACO	*Acta consiliorum œcumenicorum*, ed. E.D. Schwartz (Strasbourg-Berlin, 1914-1984)
AJT	*American Journal of Theology*
ATS	*American Theological Review*
B	*Bazmavēp* (Venice)
CSCO	*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*
CHA	*Collection d'historiens arméniens,* ed. M.F. Brosset, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1874-1876; repr. in 1 vol. Amsterdam, 1979).
HA	*Handes Amsorya.*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
NBHL	*Nor Bargirk' Haykazean Lezui*. eds. G. Awetik'ean, X. Siwrmēlean, and M. Awgerean, 2 vols. (Venice, 1836-1837).
OC	*Oriens Christianus*
OCA	*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
OCP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
REArm	*Revue des études arméniennes*

Sources:

A — *Step'anosi Tarōnec'woy Asołkan patmut'iwn tiezerakan,* ed. St. Malxaseanc', 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg 1885).

Aa — Agathangelos, *History of the Armenians*, tr. and comm. R.W. Thomson (Albany, 1976).

Acta — *Acta et symbola conciliorum quae saeculo quarto habita sunt*, ed. E.J. Jonkers (Leiden, 1954)'

A-M — *Etienne Asołik de Taron. Deuxième partie*, tr. F. Macler (Paris, 1917)

Anastas, *vardapet* See, Sanjian. (1969).

Aphraat — Aphraates, "Demonstrationes," in *Patrologia syriaca*, I, ed. R. Graffin (Turnhout, 1980).

Basil, St., *Ep* — *The Collected Letters of Saint Basil*, ed. R. J. Deferrari, 4 vols., (Cambridge-London,Loeb ed.) 1961-1962

BP — P'awstos Buzand [Ps.], *Patmut'iwn Hayoc',* 4th ed. (Venice, 1933).

BP-G — *The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk')* tr. and comm. N.G. Garsoïan (Cambridge MA, 1989).

C — F.C. Conybeare, tr. F.C. Conybeare, "The Armenian Canons of St. Sahak catholicos of Armenia (390-439 A.D.)", AJT, 118 (1898), p. 828-848.

CS — *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz (Leipzig, 1939).

CS-P — Cyril of Scythopolis, *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine.* tr. R.M. Price, comm.J. Binns (Kalamazoo, 1990).

E — Ełišēi, *Vasn Vardanay ew Hayoc' paterazmin,* ed. E. Tēr Minasean (Erevan, 1957).

E-T	*Eḷishē*, *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, tr. and comm. R.W. Thomson (Cambridge, MA, 1982).
E?M	"Ban iratu Yałags Mianjanc‘" in *Srboy Hōrn Meroy Ełišēi Vardapeti Matenagrut‘iwnk‘* (Venice, 1859), p. 159-165. trans. "Une exhortation aux moines d'Elisée l'Arménien". tr. B. Outtier in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont* (Geneva, 1988), p. 97-101.
GN	Grigor Narekac‘i, "Patmut‘iwn S. Yakobay Mcbnay hayrapetin", *Sop‘erk,* xxii (Venice, 1861), p. 1-65.
GT‘	*Girk‘ T‘łt‘oc‘*, ed. N. Połarean, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1994).
John IV, *Ep.*	"Ays t‘ułt‘ Yovhannu Erusałemi episkoposi aṙ Ałuanic‘ kat‘ołikos ē", ed. K. Tēr Mkrtč‘ean in *Ararat* (May, 1896), Appendix, p. 214-215, 252-256. trans. "Das Johannes von Jerusalem Brief an den albanischen Katholikos Abas", OC, n.s 2 (1912), p. 64-79.
John Moschos	Jean Moschus, *Le pré spirituel*, tr. M.-J. Rouët de Journel (Paris, 1946).
K	Koriwn, *Vark‘ Maštoc‘i*, ed. M. Abełean (Erevan, 1941; repr. Albany, 1985). trans. B. Norehad [K-N], (New York, 1964).
KH	*Kanonagirk‘ Hayoc‘*, ed. V. Hakobyan, 2 vols., (Erevan, 1964, 1971).
ŁP‘	*Łazaray P‘arpec‘woy patmut‘iwn Hayoc‘ ew t‘ułt aṙ Vahan Mamikonean*, eds. G. Tēr Mkrtč‘ean and St. Malxasean (Tiflis, 1904),
ŁP‘-T	*The History of Łazar P‘arpec‘i,* tr. and comm. R.W. Thomson (Atlanta, 1991).
M	Angelo Mai, "Canones Nersetis catholici (2) et Nersciabuhi episcopi Mamiconensis", *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio Vaticana …* (Rome, 1838) vol. X, p. 272-276.
M-D	*The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranc‘i,* tr. C.J.F. Dowsett (London, 1961).
MK-D	Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i, *Patmut‘iwn ałuanic‘ ašxarhi*, ed. V. Aṙak‘elyan (Erevan, 1983).
MX, Ps.	"I yišataki srboyn Hṙip‘simeay ew norun vkayakc‘ac‘n" in Movsēs Xorenac‘i, *Matenagrut‘iwnk‘* (Venice, 1865), p. 297-303. trans. Outtier-Thierry (1990).
Narratio	G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus armeniae*, CSCO 132, subs.4 (Louvain, 1952).
Proclus	*Tomus ad Armenios,* ACO, IV.ii, p. 187-195.
S	*Patmut‘iwn Sebēosi,* ed. G. Abgaryan (Erevan, 1979).
SŌ	Step‘annos Ōrbelean, *Patmut‘iwn nahangin Sisakan*, ed. K. Šahnazareanc‘, 2 vols. (Paris, 1859).
SŌ-B	*Histoire de la Siounie par Stéphannos Orbélean*, tr. M.F. Brosset., 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1864-1866).

S-T *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, vol. I, tr. R.; W. Thomson (Liverpool, 1999).

Vk “Un nouveau témoin du livre d’Agathange”, ed. and tr. M. van Esbroeck, REArm, n.s.viii (1971), p. 22-95.

Y *Girk‘ or koč‘i Yačaxapatum* (Venice, 1954).

YC Yovhannēs of Car [Dzar], “Histoire du pays des Aghovans, composée par le vartabied Iohannès de Dzar“, CHA I, p. 553-562.

YK *Pat mut‘iwn Yovhannu Kat‘ołikosi* (Jerusalem, 1867).

YK-M Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i, *History of Armenia*, tr. and comm. K.H. Maksoudian (Atlanta, 1987).

YM-Ps. See Avdoyan (1993).

ZG Zenob Glak, *Patmutiwn Tarōnoy zor targmaneac‘ Zenob Asori* (Venice, 1889). See also YM-Ps.

Literature:

ADONTZ
1970 N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian*, ed. and tr. N. Garsoïan. (Louvain, 1970).

AKINEAN
1949 N. Akinean, “Šahapivani žołovoyn kanonnerĕ, HA*,* 63 = *Mxit‘ar Tōnagirk‘* (1949), p. 79-170.

ID
1950 N. Akinean, *S. Sahaki veragruac kannonerĕ. Matenagrakan usumnasirut‘iwn* (Vienna, 1950).

ID.
1952 N. Akinean, *Bałeši Dproc‘ 1500-1700* (Vienna, 1952).

AMADUNI
1940 G. Amaduni, *Monachismo. Studio storico-canonico e fonti canoniche. Fonti, serie II, fascicolo xii: Disciplina armena* (Venice, 1940).

ID.
1958 G. Amaduni, “Le rôle historique des Hiéromoines arméniens”, *Il Monachesimo orientale* = OCA 153 (Rome, 1958).

AMIT and WOLFF
1994 D. Amit and S.R. Wolff, “An Armenian Monastery in the Morasha Neighborhood, Jerusalem” in H. Geva ed., *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed* (Jerusalem, 1994), p. 293-298.

ANANEAN
1961 P. Ananean, “La data e le circostanze della consecrazione di S Gregorio Illuminatore”, *Le Muséon,* 74 (1961), p. 43-73, 317-560; tans. from B, 117-118 (1959-1960).

AŘAK‘ELIAN
1978 B.N. Ařak‘elian, “Armenian Mosaics of the Early Middle Ages”, *Atti del primo Simposio internazionale di arte armena* (Venice, 1978), p. 1-6 and pls.

AVDOYAN
1993 L. Avdoyan, *Pseudo Yovhannēs Mamikonean. The History of Tarōn* (Atlanta, 1993).

BAKER
1968 A. Baker, "Syriac and the Origins of Monasticism", *Downside Review,* 86 (1968), p. 342-353.

BELL-MANGO
1982 Gertrude Bell, *The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur 'Abdin. With an introduction and notes by Marlia Mundell Mango* (London, 1982).

BROCK
1973 S. Brock, "Early Syrian Asceticism", *Numen* XX (1973), p. 1-19; repr. in Id., *Syriac perspectives on late antiquity* (London, 1984)

CANIVET
1977 P. Canivet, *Le monachisme syrien selon Théodoret de Cyr* (Paris, 1977).

DER NERSESSIAN
1977 S. Der Nersessian, *Armenian Art* (Paris, 1977).

VAN ESBROECK
1973 M. van Esbroeck, "La naissance du culte de saint Barthélémy en Arménie", REArm, 17 (1973), p. 171-195.

ESCOLAN
1999 Philippe Escolan, *Monachisme et Église. Le monachisme syrien du IVe au VIIe siècle: un monachisme charismatique* (Paris, 1999).

EVANS
1982 H. Evans, "Non Classical Sources for the Armenian Mosaic near the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem", in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, eds. N.Garsoïan *et al.* (Washington D.C., 1982), p. 217-221.

FLUSIN
1983 B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'œuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis* (Paris, 1983).

ID.
1992 B. Flusin, *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1992).

GARSOÏAN
1981 N. Garsoïan, "Sur le titre de 'Protecteur des pauvres'", REArm, 15 (1981), p. 21-32; repr. in Ead. (1985) §vi.

EAD.
1983 N. Garsoïan, "Nersēs le Grand, Basile de Césarée et Euthyme de Sébaste", REArm, 17 (1983), p. 145-160; repr. in Ead. (1985) §vii.

EAD.
1985 N.G. Garsoïan, *Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians* (London 1985).

EAD.
1988 N. Garsoïan, "Some preliminary precisions on the separation of the Armenian and Imperial churches: I. The presence of 'Armenian' bishops at the first five œcumenical councils", ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ. *Essays Presented to Joan Hussey on her 80th Birthday* (Camberley, 1988), p. 249-285; repr. in Ead. (1999A) §iii.

EAD.
1992 N. Garsoïan, "Quelques précisions préliminaires sur le schisme entre les Eglises byzantine et arménienne au sujet du concile de Chalcédoine: III. Les évêchés méridionaux limitrophes de la Mésopotamie" REArm, 23 (1992), p. 39-80; repr. in Ead. (1999A) §v.

EAD.
1997 N. Garsoïan, "The Independent Kingdoms of Medieval Armenia" in R. Hovannisian ed. *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times* (New York, 1997), I, p. 37-198.

EAD.
1998 N. Garsoïan, "Ἀρμενία μεγάλη καὶ ἐπαρχία Μεσοποταμίας", ΕΥΨΥΧΙΑ *Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler = Byzantina Sorbonensia,* 16 (Paris, 1998), p. 240-265; repr. in Ead. (1999A) §vi.

EAD.
1999 N. Garsoïan, *L'Eglise arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient,* CSCO 574, subs. 100 (Louvain la Neuve, 1999).

EAD.
1999A N, Garsoïan, *Church and Culture in Early Medieval Armenia* (London, 1999).

EAD.
2002 N. Garsoïan, "Le témoignage d'Anastas *vardapet* sur les monastères arméniens de Jérusalem à la fin du VIe siècle", *Travaux et Mémoires,* XIV = *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron* (2002), p. 257-267.

EAD.
2003-2004 N. Garsoïan, "L'*Histoire* attribuée à Movsēs Xorenac'i: Que reste-t-il à en dire?", REArm, 29 (2003-2004), p. 29-48.

GELZER
1895 H. Gelzer, "Die Anfänge den armenischen Kirche", *Berichte der königlichen sachsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* 47 (1895), p. 109-174.

GOLDFUS
2003 H. Goldfus, "Urban Monasticism and Monasteries of Early Byzantine Palestine — Preliminary Observations", *Aram*, 15 (2003), p. 71-79.

GRIBOMONT
1957 J. Gribomont, "Le monachisme au IVe siècle en Asie Mineure de Gangres au Messalianisme", *Studia Patristica*, II (1957), p. 400-415.

GUILLAUMONT
1968-1969 A. Guillaumont, "Le dépaysement comme forme d'ascèse dans le monachisme ancien", *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes,* Ve section, lxxvi (1968-1969), p. 31-58; repr. in Id. (1979) §6, p. 89-116.

ID.
1978 A. Guillaumont, "Perspectives actuelles sur les origines du monachisme.", *The Frontiers of Human Knowledge. Lectures held at the Quincentenary Celebration of Uppsala University 1977*, ed. T.T. Segerstedt (Uppsala, 1978), pp. 111-123; repr. in Id. (1979), §13, p. 215-227.

ID.
1979 A. Guillaumont, *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien, Spiritualités orientales* 30 (Bégrolles en Mauges, 1979).

H
1951 E. Honigman, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, subs.2 (Louvain, 1951).

ID.
1954 E.Honigman, *Le couvent de Barsauma et le patriarcat jacobite d'Antioche et de Syrie*, CSCO 146, subs. 7 (Louvain, 1954).

HAC'UNI
1930 V. Hacuni, "Erb šaradrvac en Yačaxapatum čaŕk', B*,* 88 (1930), p. 401-406.

HARL
1960 M. Harl, "À propos des *Logia* de Jésus: Le sens du mot MONAXOΣ", *Revue des études grecques*, 73 (1960), p. 464-474.

HOWARD-JOHNSON
2002 J. Howard-Johnson, "Armenian Historians of Heraclius" in *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641)*, eds. G.J. Reinink and B.H, Stolte (Leuven-Paris, 2002).

JOLY
1993 M. Joly, "Les fondations d'Euthyme et de Sabas. Texte et archéologie" in *Les saints et leurs sanctuaires à Byzance*, eds. C. Jolivet-Levy *et al.* (Paris, 1993), p. 49-64.

MAHÉ
2000 A. and J.-P.; Mahé tr. and comm. *Grégoire de Narek. Tragédie*, CSCO 584, subs. 106, (Louvain la Neuve, 2000).

MAKSOUDIAN
1982 K. Maksoudian, "Armenian Literature" in J. Strayer *et al.* eds. *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, I (New York, 1982), p. 507-512.

ID.
1987 see YK-M

MARDIROSSIAN
2004 A. Mardirossian, *Le livre des canons arméniens (Kanonagirk‘ Hayoc‘*), CSCO 606, subs. 116 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2004).

ID.
2006 A. Mardirossian, “L’Ecrit sur la tradition de saint Sahak”, *Le Muséon,* 110/’3-4 (2006), p. 375-397.

MARTIN-HISARD
1993 B. Martin-Hisard, “Christianisme et Eglise dans le monde géorgien” in *Histoire du christianisme IV: Evêques, moines et empereurs (610-1054)*, eds. G. Dagron *et al.* (Paris, 1993), p. 549-603.

MARTIN-HISARD
1998 B. Martin-Hisard, “Le christianisme et l’Eglise dans le monde géorgien” in *Histoire du christianisme III: Les Eglises d’orient et d’occident,* ed. L. Pietri (Paris, 1998), p. 1169-1239.

MATHEWS
2005 E. Mathews, “The Early Armenian Hermit: Further Reflections on the Syriac Sources“, *Saint Nersess Theological Review*, X (2005), p. 141-168.

MATHEWS-WIECK
1994 Th.F. Mathews and R.S. Wieck eds. *Treasures in Heaven. Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts* (New York, 1994).

MORARD
1973 F. Morard, “Monachos, Moine. Histoire du terme grec jusqu’au 4e siècle”, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, XX/3 (I973), p. 332-411.

EAD.
1980 F. Morard, “Encore quelques réflexions sur monachos”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980), p. 395-401.

MURRAY
1975 R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1975).

NEDUNGATT
1973 G. Nedungatt, “The Covenanters of the Early Syriac-Speaking Church”, OCP, XXXIX (1973), p. 191-215, 419-444.

OUTTIER see E?-M.

OUTTIER-THIERRY
1990 B. Outtier and M. Thierry “Histoire des saintes Hripsimiennes”. *Syria*, 67 (1990), p. 695-732.

PALMER
1980 A. Palmer, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier* (Cambridge, 1990).

PENA *et al.*
1980 I. Pena, P. Castellana, R. Fernández, *Les reclus syriens= Studium Biblicum Franciscanum,* Collectio Minor, n. 23 (Milan, 1980).

ID.
1983 I. Pena, P. Castellana, R. Fernández, *Les cénobites syriens = Studium Biblicum Franciscanum*, Collectio Minor, n. 28 (Milan, 1983).

RENOUX
1993 Ch. Renoux, "Langue et littérature arméniennes" in *Christianismes orientaux: Introduction à l'études des langues et des civilisations*", ed. M. Albert (Paris, 1993), p. 109-188.

RUSSELL
1986 J.R. Russell, "Bad Day at Burzen Mihr. Notes on an Armenian Legend of St. Bartholomew", B, 144 (1986), p. 255-267.

SANJIAN
1969 A. Sanjian, "Anastas vardapet's List of Armenian Monasteries in Seventh Century Jerusalem", *Le Muséon*, 82 (1969), p. 265-292.

SHIRINIAN
2001-2002 M.E. Shirinian, "Reflections on the 'Sons and Daughters of the Covenant' in the Armenian Sources", REArm, 28 (2001-2002), p. 261-285.

STONE
1982 M.E. Stone, *The Armenian Inscriptions from the Sinai* (Cambridge, MA, 1982).

TĒR MINASSIANTZ
1904 E. Tēr Minassiantz, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904).

THIERRY
1980 J.M. Thierry, *Le couvent arménien de Hoṙomos* (Louvain-Paris, 1980).

ID.
1983 J.M. Thierry, "Notes d'un voyage archéologique en Turquie orientale", I HA, 97 (1983), col. 379-406.

ID.
1988 M. Thierry, "Le mont Sepuh. Etude archéololgique", REArm, 21 (1988-1989) p. 385-449.

ID.
1989 J.M. Thierry, *Monuments arméniens du Vaspurakan* (Paris, 1989).

ID.
1991 J.M. Thierry, *Eglises et couvents du Karabagh* (Antelias, 1991).

ID.
1993 Michel Thierry, *Répertoire des monastères arméniens* (Turnhout, 1993).

ID.
s.d. Jean-Michel Thierry, *L'Arménie au Moyen Age: Les hommes et les monuments* (Zodiaque, s.d.).

ID.
2005 Jean-Michel Thierry de Crussol, *Monuments arméniens de Haute-Arménie* (Paris, 2005).

THIERRY-DONABEDIAN
1989 J.M. Thierry and P. Donabedian, *Armenian Art* (New York, 1989).

N. THIERRY
1978 Nicole Thierry, "Survivance d'une iconographie palestinienne de la Pentecôte au Vaspourakan", *Atti del primo Simposio internazionale di arte armena* (Venice, 1978), p. 709-722.

THOMSON
1967 R.W. Thomson, "A Seventh Century Armenian Pilgrim on Mount Tabor", JTS. n.s. 18 (1967), p. 27-33.

ID.
1985 R.W. Thomson, "Jerusalem and Armenia", *Studia Patristica*, XVIII/1, ed. E. Livingstone (Kalamazoo, 1985).

ID.
2001 R.W. Thomson, "Bitlis and Armenian Histories" in *Armenian Baghesh/Bitlis and Taron/Mush*, ed. R. Hovannisian (Costa Mesa [Mazda], 2001), p. 105-117.

THOPDSCHIAN
1904 H. Thopdschian, "Die Anfänge des armenischen Mönchtums mit Quellenkritik", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 25 (1904), p. 1-32.

TOUMANOFF
1961 C. Toumanoff, "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene" HA, 75 (1961), cols. 467-470.

ULUHOGIAN
1993 G. Uluhogian ed. and tr. *Basilio di Cesarea. Il libro delle domande. (Le regole)* 2 vols., CSCO 536, 537, (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1993).

VÖÖBUS
1958 A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* I, CSCO 184, subs, 14 (Louvain, 1958).

YOUNG
s.d. R. Young, "The Vocabulary of Monasticism in the 'Yacaxapatum Čaṙk'", unpublishedd paper, s.d.